RED PILL IDEOLOGY

LIFTING THE SHINY WRAPPING FROM THE MANOSPHERE

Cynthia Payne

Red Pill Ideology:
Lifting the Shiny Wrapping from the Manosphere

Cynthia Payne

© 2022 by Cynthia Payne

All rights reserved. No portion of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission from the author, except as is permitted by U.S. copyright law such as short passages intended for purposes such as criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching, scholarship, or research. For additional permissions, please contact me, Cynthia Payne, through my website at http://cynthiapayne.webnode.page

Contents

What is Red Pill? And Why Write a Book to Debunk it?

Alpha-Seed Beta-Need, Hypergamy, and the Jargon of Red Pill

The Very First Beta Male

The Feminine Primary Order

War Brides, or What's Rape Got to do with it, Evolutionarily Speaking?

Economics of Pussy and the Sexual Marketplace

Hypocrisy, Frame, and Why Red Pill is like the Banking Industry

References / Bibliography

For my sons, Robert and Samuel.
Never stop asking questions.

What is Red Pill? And Why Write a Book to Debunk it?

Remember, all I'm offering is the truth. Nothing more.

- Morpheus, *The Matrix* (1999)

Red Pill is a metaphor taken from the 1999 blockbuster hit movie *The Matrix* starring Keanu Reeves as Neo. In the movie, Neo unknowingly lives in a computer simulation until he is recruited by freedom fighters who offer Neo either a red or blue pill to swallow. The blue pill will allow him to stay in his comfortable, but fake, reality while the red pill will expose all the lies of his society and set him free.

In context, the lies Red Pill claims to reveal is how men have been conditioned by society to allow themselves to be subjugated by feminism to men's unwitting and ongoing detriment. Red Pill is an evolution of the 1990s-era pickup artist (PUA) and seeks to explain, using data, rational reasoning, psychology, and evolutionary biology, why the tactics of the PUA work. Red Pill is ultimately a philosophy that promises men the secrets of how to avoid being taken advantage of and emotionally hurt by women.

Red Pill gets a lot of hate from people because of the misogyny many feel is a marker of its community. Red Pill advocates insist that the purpose of Red Pill is not to hate women, but instead to allow men to understand women so they can stop being so frustrated by them. They claim the primary purpose of Red Pill is clarity—intergender dynamics is confusing and the olde-timey models our great-grandparents used in courtship no longer apply in a world where women are capable of supporting themselves, where birth control is both reliable and readily available, and where a dependence upon social media has made social retards of us all. So many men today are desperately seeking answers and direction.

These men have usually had difficulty in navigating this new terrain and are looking for answers on how to do it better and how to protect themselves. They perceive an increasingly hostile and confusing environment for men. They want to feel like they have a clue as to what they are doing, much like the rest of us. Red Pills offers an answer, and frustrated men flock to it.

I am not unsympathetic, and I intend to approach this topic

from the mindset that the above sentiment is true—that Red Pill is about understanding women so that both genders can get what they want. I honestly have no problem with men wanting to get laid more—more power to them. I didn't start out with the intention of writing a refute to Red Pill, but instead started looking into Red Pill claims and trying to verify its theories as simply a way to understand the perspective. I believe I have achieved my original goal of understanding Red Pill men's perspective; it's just not the same conclusions Red Pill men have come to, and I've approached this book with that same attitude. Men deal with a lot of shit that they don't get a lot of support to deal with. A lot of what Red Pill teaches makes sense, at least on the surface. There is no reason to berate men who are trying to make sense of things. Red Pill, as I explain in later chapters, offers a lot of value to men and I have no desire to minimize that value. Ultimately, this book will be dedicated to my two sons. They're six now, but I hope one day they will read it, and I don't want them to think less of me and my approach towards people I disagree with after they do read it.

I have spent a great amount of time interacting with Red Pill men in an effort to understand what they believe, their rationale for believing it, and how they feel about it. Subchapters within this book highlighted in **bold** are real questions and comments I have received from Red Pill men during my research. I have tried to edit them as little as possible, but many did need paraphrasing or editing when the question was part of a larger conversation whose context didn't fit the place in the book I'd chosen to address the question. On the whole, I have found Red Pill men to be quite forthcoming when respectfully approached. Like anyone with strong beliefs, they want to talk about and share their ideas. Their entirely voluntary assistance to someone who they (often) knew was attempting to upend their belief system is genuinely appreciated, and I wanted to have their voices represented in this book.

If there is one universal amongst the men I conversed with, it is that they truly believe that Red Pill is science. They believe Red Pill is about facts, not beliefs. Many of them don't even like Red Pill's assertions, but since they believe Red Pill's conclusions are built from scientific methods and not the hap-hazard inductive reasoning that the Red Pill foundation actually is, they feel it would be counter-intuitive not to accept the harsh reality as Red Pill describes it. I have encountered a lot of hate and anger from Red Pill men, but also a great deal of pain, fear, and uncertainty. Over time, as a few got to know me and my style a bit more, they became genuinely interested in my work and have been following my progress. Some have even become active participants in the pre-publication process. I have

become friends with some of these men. Some of my beta and advanced readers—essential members of any book-publishing team—were Red Pill men. I've come to respect and admire these individuals, and hope they will be proud of what I've done with their many contributions. This is an anti-Red Pill book, but it is not a "Red Pill is evil" book. Red Pill men feel that Red Pill gives them a strength and certainty they lacked before discovering Red Pill, and I want to foster a conversation, not just make accusations.

Do you really think any man who has taken the Red Pill is going to be convinced by you to spit it out?

Nope. That has never been the goal. This book isn't for Red Pill men, although I certainly welcome them. This book if for the men who took the Red Pill and then started having questions that Red Pill couldn't answer. This book is for the women whose boyfriends and husbands and brothers and sons have recently discovered Red Pill, and the women are now searching for answers to what they see as nonsensical facts and misogynistic conclusions. This book is for anyone who has been exposed to Red Pill and knew it didn't add up, but couldn't quite explain why they felt that way.

That feeling of "wrongness" is a lack of vocabulary. I believe I can help with that.

If you agree that the tactics Red Pill teaches work, and you don't have a problem with men using the tactics, then why write a book debunking Red Pill?

Because foundations matter. My problem with Red Pill is that I believe the underlying model, or ideology, of Red Pill to be patently false and nonsensical. Ultimately, Red Pill is a 'reasoning-based' belief system, not an "evidence-based" belief system, and… frankly, most Red Pill men and women simply don't know how to Science or how to verify the claims they keep spreading around. Red Pill believes it uses logic and deductive reasoning, but in reality it uses sloppy inductive reasoning and cherry-picked evidence. Just because something seems to make sense does not mean it's true. Red Pill's intent to better understand women's sexual motivations is a perfectly valid and righteous goal, but a poor base understanding of women's nature leads to incorrect conclusions of otherwise good data and has the very real potential of causing further damage and unhappiness to men and women's lives.

In the 1500s, intelligent men and women looked up into the sky and reasoned that the sun revolved around the earth. It made

sense given the evidence they had, and Ptolemy could accurately predict how planets moved, but ultimately his model wasn't true because he possessed a faulty base understanding of the system as a whole. What harm is there in a faulty foundation if the rules seem to work? Well, had the foundational knowledge never been revisited, then Newton could never have explained the laws of gravity. Without the law of gravity, Newton could not have completed his laws of motion, which are the foundation of modern mechanics. Among many other things, the ability to do the math to engineer the modern internal combustion engine depends upon Newton's laws. Cars, airplanes, rockets, defense missiles and so much more owe their existence to the more accurate understanding of how things work that Sir Isaac Newton provided. Ptolemy's model worked for what people were using it for—predicting how planets moved—but it was an incorrect model. Ptolemy's ideas worked, but they were still wrong. Red Pill is no different, and I propose that it is this faulty base understanding of Red Pill's that is responsible for the more toxic and outright misogynistic aspects of Red Pill and the further extremes of Red Pill, specifically MGTOW (Men Going Their Own Way), Black Pill, Incels (Involuntary Celibates), and I'd estimate at least half of the mainstream Red Pill community as a whole.

For an extreme and modern example of this, I recommend the 2015 TED Talk given by Shreena Thakore entitled "It Matters WHY You Think Rape is Wrong," in which she explains her struggles in fighting institutionalized rape in India. Thakore has no problem finding men who agree with her that rape is wrong, and in fact rarely comes across men who think rape is not a heinous crime that should be punished to the full extent of the law. Modern men in India fully comprehend that rape is wrong because it "violates the honor, dignity, and respectability of a woman, and her family, and her community, and the nation." So why does she continue in her campaign? Because "the honor, dignity, and respectability of a woman" is a gender norm. In India, rape is considered wrong because it violates these gender norms. Another Indian gender norm is that men should protect women, and if rape is happening, then that means men are not protecting women enough. The answer to this is to tell men that "real men" respect women and "real men" walk women to the door after 9pm, and that women should stay in the house more and not go out unaccompanied by men and not wear revealing clothing.

The problem with this foundational belief system is that women in this model have no agency of their own—they are subject to the whims of men who must choose to be protectors, violators, or neutral bystanders. The women are regulated to entirely passive roles. When it is believed that rape is wrong because it violates gender

norms, the answer is to more strictly enforce those same gender norms.

Thakore does not encounter men and women who are pro-rape and regularly encounters men and women who are upset by her talks because "we are on your side. We are not part of the problem. Go talk to the rapists." Unfortunately, as Thakore explains, you don't have to be a rapist to be part of the problem of rape. If you believe that rape is wrong because it is a violation of the honor, dignity, and respectability of a woman, then the rape of a sex worker who does not have these things cannot occur—or at least it is a much "smaller" crime than rape of a "virtuous" woman because the sex worker has already violated the gender norms for what a woman's sexual activities "should" be, thus there is either nothing to dishonor or significantly less to dishonor than with an honorable woman. This is a predictable and unfortunately real attitude in the modern world where rape is believed to be wrong for these reasons.

Thakore talks about a case in India where the leaders of a village ordered the gang rape of a man's sister as punishment for that man attempting to molest another woman. These leaders believe that rape is wrong—that is why they are punishing the man, to the full extent of their authority, for the molestation. However, because their foundation for believing rape is wrong is based on violating the "honor, dignity, and respectability of a woman and her family and her community" they also believe that gang raping this man's sister is fair punishment for her brother's attempted dishonoring of a different girl.

By raping one woman, these leaders, through violating honor and dignity and respectability, can punish an entire community of people. It's incredibly efficient.

Rape is not a violation of a woman's honor, dignity, or respectability. Rape is a violation of an individual's right to bodily integrity and autonomy. Once this foundational paradigm shift of understanding why rape is wrong is adopted, it is suddenly realized that all the previous solutions make no sense. Telling women to stay at home or to not wear certain clothes is also a violation of her autonomy. How does it make sense to punish a victim with a different version of the same sin? Rape cannot be used to punish a community because it is only the individual's rights that are being violated. The rape of a sex worker is just as much of a crime as the rape of a woman conforming to gender norms because they both have the same basic human right to bodily integrity.

Foundations matter. When the foundational understanding is wrong, the irony is that the logical conclusion of "rape is wrong" is to go out and rape more women. This is a very extreme example, but it's

also a very real one, and it's unacceptable.

I intend to demonstrate how the foundational claims made by Red Pill are not based on accurate portrayals of facts or on scientific methods, or even on rational extrapolation of observable data within the framework known scientific theories. They are instead based on faulty inductive reasoning, on speculation, and on Red Pill's own theories and imaginings taken as fact in order to support the next level of inductive reasoning and speculation.

I will further demonstrate how the fundamentals of Red Pill lead to inherent misogyny and should be rejected, even if a number of the teachings of Red Pill are still valuable and should be kept. Most of the tactics and advice Red Pill gives works—but not for the reasons it claims. I maintain there is a lot of good to be found in Red Pill and I have no problem regularly praising it for giving many men the kick in the ass they need to start taking responsibility for themselves, their health, and their own destinies. This is the same way I can praise modern feminism for giving many women the kick in the ass they need to start taking responsibility for their own lives and destinies while still being able to recognize the more toxic and harmful aspects of the ideology.

Men go to Red Pill for practical advice, so it's not enough for me to say "this is why Red Pill is incorrect" and leave it at that. Because of this, I have tried when possible to provide alternative theories and ideas that do support the available evidence in order to build a new framework for understanding the current and unprecedented sexual marketplace that modern western humans have found themselves in. While I don't claim to have all the answers, I believe this is an important inclusion to give readers different ways of conceptualizing the information being discussed and to provide opportunities to practice examining Red Pill (and other) claims critically. I want to help men and women better understand the behavior of women and better understand the economics of how relationships work so that more men and women can get what they want. My hope is that by getting closer to the true base foundation, modern men will be able to build better ideologies that benefit them and help them achieve their goals, whether those goals are to improve their existing relationships, to optimize their level of sexual attraction to women, to build lasting, stable, and happy families, or to just get laid more.

Why are you calling Red Pill an ideology?

Red Pill self-identifies as a praxeology, a 19th century term

defined as the science of human action, which until Red Pill adopted it has almost exclusively been used to describe the action/consequence relationship of human choice within monetary economic systems. Praxeology is used to develop foundational theories as to why economic environments behave the way they do and to make predictions about how trends will play out in the future. When people use praxeology such as game theory to strategize, they are moving beyond the purely theoretical world of study and observation and moving into action. Going further and adopting those strategies as a way of life moves into philosophy and ideology.

Red Pill *vehemently* objects to being referred to as an ideology because it recognizes that ideologies have agendas. Ideologies do not passively deal with information as it presents itself and update any theories it may have as that new data comes in, but instead cherry-picks information it sees as supporting its preconceived beliefs. Worst of all, ideologies are required to defend their own moral and ethical standards. If Red Pill were indeed an ideology, then Red Pill would be corrupting the pureness of the praxeology it claims to be and could no longer claim to be morally neutral. If Red Pill were an ideology, then there would be room for alternative and equally valid ideologies that would compete for Red Pill's current customers and may even be a better fit for those customer's own personal needs, goals, and beliefs. This would be terribly inconvenient for Red Pill's assertion that it is the sole reliable source for lifting the veil of the feminine imperative so that men can see the simple and cold-hard truth of intergender dynamics. If Red Pill were an ideology instead of a praxeology, Red Pill would have to convince people that its theories were the correct ones instead of simply crowning itself the King of Truth and calling anyone who doesn't immediately agree with them "blue-pill betas." As I like to joke, the first line in Red Pill's manifesto is "We are not a cult!"

So let's really talk about this. Another praxeology is linguistics, which is the study of how languages evolve over time. One of the foundational theories of linguistics is that sounds made "higher up" in the mouth are easier and more economical to make, and so we should expect the pronunciation of certain words and sounds that are "low in the mouth" to evolve over time to become more economical. This theory states that words like "ask" will eventually evolve to be pronounced as "axe" because of this phenomenon. Linguistics also predicts that languages are "pruned" of complexity when exposed to foreign languages, while more remote languages will become unsustainably complicated in their grammar structure due to lack of pruning. These fundamental theories and understandings based on observations can be used to help researchers develop theories of how

and when historical cultures came into contact with each other and how.

Were linguistic theorists to suggest that a secluded tribe attempt to learn a foreign language as a way of pruning their own and thus potentially preserve their own cultural heritage for longer than it would endure otherwise, they are offering a strategy based on a praxeology. If linguistic theorists were to start spouting that everyone "should" learn a dying language or dialect in order to preserve the culture that used that language, because keeping a living record is important for understanding the cultures of the past, then linguistics would be crossing into the realm of holding ideals and beliefs that influence ongoing behavior and would then rightfully be considered an ideology. It's highly likely at that point that a rival linguistic faction would spring up with different beliefs and ideals about dying languages being part of the natural life cycle of languages. They would say that a better way of preserving the past is to simply resist the changes in pronunciation that tend to evolve. So instead of learning dead or dying languages, everyone "should" start pronouncing "home" as "ham" and "woman" as "wifman."

Just like with religion, an ideology in this context is an interpretation of an underlying praxeology. Christianity, Judaism, and Islam all use the same Bible, yet all three religions have wildly different interpretations about what that Bible says and what it means for the belief systems, practices, and lifestyles of their followers. The way the Bible is interpreted doesn't just effect the more abstract and metaphysical beliefs of religious devotees, such as whether a Holy Trinity exists or whether humans can become Saints you can pray to. It affects everyday life choices such as whether bacon is an acceptable breakfast item, how many times a day and when in the day you need to take a break from work to pray, and even whether to celebrate major holidays that involve a fat guy in a red suit breaking into your house.

Praxeology is the observation and study of a thing, strategy is the application of what is learned in that study to solve a problem, and ideology is using interpretations of the observations of the thing in order to develop a core set of ideals and beliefs that influence ongoing lifestyles and behavior.

Linguistics and economics are observations, theory, and study. There is nothing about economics or linguistics that states one strategy or agenda should be favored over another—it is simply a way to understand the foundational workings of a complex system. What a person does with that information is separate from the study of it. Economics is a praxeology; businesses can use this praxeology to

strategize how to minimize the opportunity cost of a new venture, while capitalism, socialism, communism, and Marxism are all ideologies which use ideals to explain a framework of how business "should" be conducted. Political science is a praxeology; a politician can use this praxeology to strategize how best to spin a piece of bad news in the media, while liberalism, conservatism, socialism, democracy, and globalism are all ideologies which offer a framework of ideals and ideas of how things "should" work. Evolutionary biology is a praxeology; pick-up-artists use theories based on that praxeology to strategize how to score with women, and "taking the Red Pill" means adopting a framework of ideals, ideas, and codes of conduct that affect everyday life choices and behavior.

While Red Pill may have started out as an attempt to explain the effectiveness of PUA techniques, it long ago evolved into an ideology that promotes lifestyle ideals based upon its interpretation of those observations. Red Pill teaches that men "should" perform any number of behaviors, from working out to eschewing exclusive relationships with women (or, at the very least, men should "spin plates" to foster a mindset of abundance should he choose the ill-advised route of an actual committed relationship) to rejecting women who refuse to have sex on their timetable to adopting more "alpha" qualities. The core of the assertion of Red Pill is that modern men have surrendered themselves to feminism. According to Red Pill, feminism is really nothing more than a subversion of the positive role of masculinity which has transformed men from their rightful place as leaders of civilization to its servants so that women can replace them as leaders. A Red Pill man "should" make himself his own mental point of origin in order to push back against the "Feminine Imperative" and the demands of equality which are nothing more than a test ("shit test") to see which men are brave enough to resist it and gain a woman's admiration for his defiant act of courage. There are "rules" describing how Red Pill men "should" conduct themselves in their relationships with women lest they regress into blue-pill beta subjugation. Red Pill envisions a world where men are "real men" who are productive and build civilizations and have many sexual options amongst many beautiful women, and women are "real women" who work hard to preserve their beauty and submit to men and are all the happier for doing it.

Red Pill, whether it likes it or not, is an ideology.

What qualifications do you have to write about Red Pill?

I am a thirty-six-year-old mother of two. I married my husband

when I was twenty-two-years-old, shortly after receiving my Bachelors of Science degree in Biology. I served for six years as a uniformed Deputy Sheriff—two years in Animal Control and four years as a technician in my department's forensic DNA and drug laboratory. I was forced to retire for health reasons and am now a stay-at-home-mom, published author, homeschooler, homesteader, occasional Youtuber, and the proud owner of a small herd of miniature dairy goats.

In other words, I seem to be just as qualified to write a book about Red Pill as literally everyone else who has ever written a book about Red Pill.

Alpha-Seed Beta-Need, Hypergamy, and the Jargon of Red Pill

You destroyed me, Mr. Anderson. After that, I understood the rules. I knew what I was supposed to do, but I didn't. I couldn't. I was compelled to stay, compelled to disobey. And now, here I stand because of you, Mr. Anderson. Because of you, I'm no longer an Agent of the system. Because of you, I've changed. I'm unplugged. A new man, so to speak. Like you, apparently, free.

- Agent Smith

Congratulations.

- Neo *The Matrix Reloaded* (2003)

The first thing you need to know about Red Pill is that there is a lot of vocabulary that goes along with Red Pill.

The main cornerstone of Red Pill belief is that all women have a dualistic mating strategy called hypergamy. Now, in non-Red Pill circles, hypergamy refers to the tendency for women to marry up in the social hierarchy. In other words, a woman choosing to marry a man richer than the family she came from, or a man who has better social connections or who is more educated than she is. This is a pretty well-established definition of hypergamy and its reality is reasonably consistent across cultures, at least until recently (Esteve, Albert et al.; Chudnovskaya, Margarita).

Within Red Pill, however, hypergamy takes on an entirely different importance and definition. Two definitions, actually. First, Red Pill believes women are continuously hypergamous. In other words, a woman is not just looking to get married to a man higher-up on the food chain, but even after she is married she will be driven to trade up if she feels she has the opportunity to do so. Traditional definitions of hypergamy and hypergamy as it is understood outside of the manosphere only holds it to apply to women *seeking* a relationship. A one-and-done situation, as it were, until and unless the woman finds herself single again. Traditional definitions of hypergamy do not apply to women who have already made her mate choice and this difference in definitions between common usage and Red Pill is important to understand as we discuss it.

Secondly, Red Pill claims that women have a dual mating

strategy they call “alpha-seed beta-need,” or sometimes “alpha-fucks beta-bucks.” Furthermore, Red Pill asserts that women are biologically programmed to go through various life stages where she will favor one side of her hypergamy over the other, i.e., either “alphas” that a woman will seek out in order to secure superior DNA to have children with, or “betas” she will seek out later in life to secure provisioning and support for those children. Thus, Red Pill insists that monogamous long-term relationships with modern women are essentially fairy tales and that unless a man can continuously “game” the same woman for decades on-end to trick her into seeing him as the best she can get, then a woman’s hypergamy will inevitably cause a married woman to either divorce or at least seek other men for sex and cuckold her poor beta husband.

AWALT, or All Women Are Like That, is a critical component of this theory. In Red Pill’s worldview, all women share this common hypergamy and dualistic mating strategy. It is biological and inborn and not something they can overcome. This is a major part of what Red Pill claims is women’s innate solipsism, in which women cannot love men the way men want to be loved, and instead love men only opportunistically. According to Red Pill, a woman’s inherent solipsism makes her incapable of seeing the world through any lenses other than a woman’s viewpoint and specifically through a hypergamous viewpoint. Her love for a man is based on conditional qualifiers of what he can provide for her rather than the inherent idealistic love that is innate to men. Men, Red Pill insists, are the only true romantics who can love their mates unconditionally, while the only unconditional love a woman can offer is to her children.

While narcissism shares a large overlap with solipsism, Red Pill asserts women are this way because they have to be—because evolution made them this way. Solipsistic women who easily traded up for higher-value men and easily discarded lower-value men were more likely to survive and secure better provisioning and genetics for their children. This was a critical component for the survival of the species as a whole, despite the inevitable emotional trauma and fallout that it burdened men with. Women who did not hold the conviction that their own self-importance and the interests of their children were the most important things in the universe simply did not pass on their genes to the next generation. Women with the better internal “rationalization hamsters” churning out reasons why it was okay to step on others to get to the top had better survival rates. Thus, women’s innate solipsism is more about evolutionary pragmatism than it is about selfishness. Because of this, Red Pill asserts that women’s solipsism isn’t a character flaw of women per se, only a fact of life that should be accepted as such. Red Pill’s argument is that women

shouldn't be blamed for their solipsism, and men need to simply get over it and accept it as reality.

There is not a lot of agreement on what, exactly, defines an "alpha" male and a "beta" male within the Red Pill community. There are some generalities, like alphas tend to be on the top of social hierarchies, are confident, are good with women, and are physically imposing and/or attractive. Betas seem to be defined mostly as "not alphas" by whatever definition of alpha that particular individual is using. While there is a high level of agreement that alphas are alphas because of genetically inborn traits, such as higher testosterone levels or squarer jaws, Red Pill is big on encouraging beta men to develop more alpha traits. So, while most Red Pill discussions deal in binary absolutes, there does seem to be an understanding that "alpha" and "beta" are two ends on a spectrum and one can gradually become the other.

Some think only betas care about assuring paternity while no alpha would ever give a damn if a kid was his or not, while others say betas are willing to raise another man's kids in exchange for semi-regular sex while only alphas will demand absolute fidelity from their long-term women because alphas care the most about paternity. For some Red Pill advocates, the willingness to ever get married is de facto proof that a man is a beta, no matter his other alpha qualifications. Others point to the existence of r/marriedredpill on Reddit with its 40,000 members and growing as proof that alphas can say "I do" without losing their alpha-ness.

There are a lot of correlations with physical attraction, muscles, and high-earnings with alphas and a high association of sex-starved, out-of-shape frustrated chumps with betas, but past those generalizations the only thing Red Pill as a whole seems to be able to agree defines an alpha as an alpha and a beta as a beta is which side of the Madonna-Whore complex their mating strategy falls on. For the purposes of this book I will use this lowest common denominator definition: alpha men utilize a sexual strategy of seducing many women while committing to none exclusively and who invest little to nothing into their offspring, while beta men utilize a sexual strategy of investing heavily into one woman and into any children she produces. Alpha men have a stronger drive to seek new sexual partners than they have to pair bond with a previous sexual partner, while beta men have a stronger drive to pair bond with a previous sexual partner than they have to seek new sexual partners.

Closely associated with the alpha and beta archetypes is the idea of "high-value men" and "low-value men." Here, at least, Red Pill offers some more concrete definitions. The most common definitions

of high-value men I've seen are taken from the late Youtuber Kevin Samuels. Samuels defines a high-value man as a man who:

> (1) Earns $10,000 monthly and has sustained that earning level for a minimum of three years.
>
> (2) Has a network of other high-value men he can utilize as contacts and is accepted by those other high-value men as a high-value man. This means he both brings value to the table and can take value from the table.
>
> (3) Has a career description that is immediately recognizable. This means any Joe off the street, upon hearing the high-value man's occupation, immediately understands the services that high-value man can provide for him.

There are other specific qualifiers to what constitutes high-value men, specifically regarding age. While not a definition for being high-value, there is a near universal agreement in the Red Pill community that men "peak" in their sexual market value at a much later age than women. Specifically, women supposedly reach their sexual market value peak in their early twenties, while men reach their peak in their mid-to-late thirties.

A low-value man is someone who has little or nothing of value to offer a woman or to the world at large. A low-value man is typically imagined to be a 20-something overweight, unemployed man who lives in his mother's basement and plays video games all day.

To explain all this, Red Pill's ideology is fundamentally based on a game called evolutionary biology and evolutionary psychology. This is a game intellectuals like to play where they try to explain why we behave today the ways we do by looking to the past to see how that behavior may have evolved. Red Pill calls it a pragmatism of observational truth. It's a very fun game, and I enjoy playing it.

The rules of this game are very simple: what you see is what you get, and then you must explain why, using the accepted concepts of evolutionary biology, what you see was beneficial to our ancestors and how it's been twisted or perverted by modern life. The basic understanding of "what was beneficial" is "what allowed to best chance of survival along with the most chance of producing offspring." Those who died young did not reproduce or reproduced less than those with longer lifespans, and those who survived a long time but didn't reproduce didn't pass on their genes to the next generation, and thus their traits would not be observable in our modern times.

For example: People crave and eat large amounts of sugary sweet food despite being overweight and diabetic. Being overweight

and especially being diabetic is highly associated with a lower lifespan and a poor quality of life, so it doesn't make evolutionary sense that our genes would want us to be overweight and diabetic. To play the game of evolutionary biology and psychology, we ask "why are we driven to consume sugary foods to excess?" We imagine what life was like for our hunter-gatherer ancestors and come up with the hypothesis that they did not have as much easy access to high-sugar food as we do in the modern world. We postulate that the only time our ancient ancestors would come across sugary foods would be ripe fruits or honey, two things that would have a very short shelf life and only be available occasionally. Both fruit and honey have beneficial nutritional characteristics to ancient man: fruit is nutrient and vitamin dense, and honey is calorie dense. Our modern intellectual comes to the conclusion that humans evolved to crave sugary foods because the ancient peoples who gorged themselves with fruit and honey when they could got more benefit than those who just ate a mouthful or two. Since it was such a rare occurrence to come across this sugary foods, ancient man never had to deal with the negative consequences of becoming overweight or diabetic. Thus, it is only a problem now that we crave sugary foods because of our modern way of life with our constantly available processed and sugary foods. From this hypothesis, we can develop strategies that helps us understand how and why we should behave differently than our bodies tell us to: since we are not living in a natural environment, we must use our wisdom, intellect, and willpower to moderate our sugar and calorie intake so that we do not suffer the negative consequences of obesity and diabetes that our once-beneficial evolutionary protocol once dictated.

This game gets much more complicated and much more fun when we start looking at human mating strategies. Since most of our early ancestor's daily lives is left up to conjecture, we can get wildly different theories as to how early human sexuality played out. For instance, the controversial *Sex at Dawn* by Christopher Ryan and Cacilda Jethá hypothesizes that early humans were sexually indiscriminate and polyamorous, had little concern with paternity, and that all sexual competition manifested as sperm competition—that is, occurred within the women's bodies post-copulation. Ryan and Jethá conclude that monogamy is a social construct and contrary to our true evolutionary nature. Others take a very different approach, saying that it's monogamy that is our natural state and infidelity that is a socially driven behavior. The main idea here is that, unlike the sugary foods example, there is no universally accepted theory, at least on an evolutionary basis, that accounts for modern human sexuality. Each theory has its own reasoning, its own evidentiary support, and its own critics. Everyone playing the game comes up with their own

story. Red Pill has played the game and came up with alphas, betas, hypergamy, and solipsism. I played the game and came up with something similar, yet completely different.

First, I should start with where Red Pill and I agree, and that is with a man named Robert Briffault—French surgeon, social anthropologist, and novelist (my kind of guy!). Briffault's Law states:

> "The female, not the male, determines all the conditions of the animal family. Where the female can derive no benefit from association with the male, no association exists."

Different species have different levels of association between its males and females. Tigers are largely solitary creatures with the males and females only coming together to mate. Due to having few natural predators and being born with fur, the mother tiger is able to leave her newborn cubs unattended for long periods so she can patrol her small 2-4 square mile territory and hunt. Female tigers have no need to associate with male tigers beyond mating, so no association exists.

On the flip side, another large cat, the lion, lives in an environment where solitary hunting is far less successful than in the environments where tigers live. Female lions utilize teamwork to take down prey and form prides. This adaptation has evolved due to a concept called reciprocal altruism. The main idea is that by working together, each individual female lion benefits more than she would by working alone. Because lions live in an environment where their prey can see them coming and have large open spaces to run away in, groups of lions end up eating more food than a solitary lion even though each individual lion must share any food caught. Because of this net benefit, genes for reciprocal altruism spread in the population and lions became a species where teamwork is the norm versus tigers where teamwork is never seen.

Because many lions require a much larger territory than a single tiger, females associate with males for security. The male lion does occasionally participate in hunts, but his primary function in the pride is to patrol and defend its borders—up to one hundred square miles of it. Since the females derive a benefit from associating with the males, an association exists.

The necessity of a human male/female association is not difficult to figure out—pregnancy is difficult and limiting for women, and newborns are helpless and require a large amount of attention and provisioning. The cost of child rearing is extremely high in humans and women need help. That's where an association with men comes in: men supply needed provisioning and security for the

handicapped mother and baby. This fact of women historically needing men to help with child rearing and provisioning is also undisputed between myself and Red Pill.

Women seek alpha men when they're young and at their most fertile and betas when they've hit the wall and need provisioning.

This is the part where Red Pill shows that they do not know how to Science. Red Pill is insistent upon the concept of women having set life phases they go through where they prefer one side of their hypergamy over the other. According to Red Pill, young women from puberty through their "party years" of 20-27 favor short-term sexual relationships with alpha men. This corresponds with women's peak fertility years and her highest sexual marketplace value (when she is most desired by the highest number of men), allowing her to procreate with the highest-quality males she will ever be able to secure. After that, women go through a transitional phase from 27 to 30 before hitting "the wall," or a point where her age and reduced sexual market value become evident and she is no longer able to compete with younger, sexier women coming onto the sexual marketplace. At this point, Red Pill asserts, women enter their "security phase" where they will seek to marry and lock down a beta —someone to offer them and their illegitimate alpha spawn safety and provisioning. Less talked about are later phases where women supposedly have a resurge in interest in pursuing alphas before once again preferring betas.

First off, no-way-no-how does an 18-year-old hunter-gatherer woman not already have a baby on her hip and *possibly* another on the way. The Ache in Paraguay are one of the few remaining nomadic hunter-gatherer societies still living and their women's average age of first birth is 17.5 years of age. A study of modern Gambian women, who live in an environment where it is often difficult for children to get sufficient quality nutrition, found that the optimal age of first-births for women to optimize their lifetime reproductive success was at eighteen years of age. This was the point in a food resource-limited environment that balanced delaying reproduction to allow the woman time to gain more weight, height, and nutrient reserves with the diminishing returns of producing fewer healthy children over the course of her lifespan (Allal, N).

The spread of agriculture from 10,000-12,000 years ago and the presence of more abundant food in childhood drastically decreased the average age of first births for humans. Ancient Jewish law describes twelve years and one day as the youngest age a woman

can marry, and most Jewish scholars of past centuries recommended women be married as soon as they reached puberty, or as soon as their menses began, in order to prevent sexual immorality and illegitimate children (Jewish Virtual Library). This law comes from the Talmud, the basis of rabbinic law, which has been practiced since the 4th century. This practice corresponds with marriage laws and first-birth ages in ancient Egypt, medieval Europe, imperial China, and a swath of other ancient societies who practiced agriculture in years that are and are not followed by "B.C." (Herlihy, David; Lee, Jen-Der). Before we cast negative judgement—men were eligible for marriage at age 13 or 14. This was considered adulthood in those times.

Women simply could not have evolved to have these "party years" where they shun betas and prefer short-term sexual escapades with alphas because women spent their early twenties already saddled with children. The need for provisioning is not an afterthought—it is a need that becomes critical during the pregnancy itself. Our ancestral women would already need a beta provider long before she reached her peak sexual market value, which isn't until approximately age 21-23, according to Red Pill. If Red Pill is correct with their women's life phase theory, then that transition period should be much earlier—probably closer to age 13-18, at which point it would make more sense for a woman to transition into her "beta" phase. It's highly unlikely a hunter-gatherer woman and her children could survive the long party years without significant provisioning from a dedicated mate. To put it frankly: it doesn't matter how good the alpha's genes are if the kid doesn't survive.

Sexual selection pressures in modern times post-birth control pill have altered women's sexual preferences.

The idea that our western population has had an evolutionary shift since the availability of reliable birth control in the 1960s is an unfortunately common belief amongst individual Red Pill advocates within the community. To Red Pill's credit, I have not seen this error in any of Red Pill's more commonly cited literature. However, because I've encountered it so often in my research and interactions with Red Pill advocates, and because it seems to be such a widely held belief within the community, I will address it here.

Evolution is a process that occurs to a population, not to an individual, and it is a process that occurs very, very slowly.

An interesting example is the common fruit fly, *Drosophila*. The female fly is promiscuous, and the male has developed a counter-strategy of lacing his ejaculate with a chemical that acts as an anti-aphrodisiac along with other chemicals that work to incapacitate the

sperm of other males. It's important to note that these adaptations have evolved for the male's reproductive benefit and not for the species' benefit—these same chemicals are similar to spider venom, are toxic, and drastically reduce the female's lifespan. However, the male's interest in the female extends only so long as it takes for her to lay the eggs fertilized by him. The likelihood of these two individual *Drosophila* having a future joint reproductive venture is minute, so even if the male harms the female by reducing her future reproductive output, that has no bearing on the pressures shaping *his* gene's survival and reproduction (Birkhead).

When researchers decided to dramatically change the fly's sexual environment, as meddling researchers are wont to do, an interesting phenomenon occurred. With enforced monogamy the pressures on the male fly were all of the sudden directly linked to the female's reproductive longevity, and over time the male *Drosophila* produced less and less of the toxic chemicals with their semen and became less and less aggressive towards their mates. Although production of the chemicals had not stopped at the conclusion of the experiment, they had been reduced to the point where the female fruit flies were enjoying a roughly 10-20% longer lifespan. It took 47 generations (Holland, B).

Wikipedia describes a human generation to be approximately 20-30 years. Even if women are having their first children in their early teens, they are also having children into their thirties, so there is an average. If we use the lower end of this definition, with the earliest reliable modern birth control becoming publically available in the 1960s, then our modern genome has had all of three generations to contend with a new and unnatural sexual environment. That's nothing. That's a drop in the bucket.

To put this into context, the *Drosophila* experiment represented a complete, strictly enforced, and totally alien sexual environment than the flies had evolved with. Birth control does give humans a similar alien sexual environment, but it doesn't come with the totality or strict enforcement of a laboratory experiment. For modern humans to have the same conditions that led to such a quick change in genome, we would have to have zero mixing between the descendants of women who use birth control to delay pregnancy until their late twenties (or whenever) along with the men chosen by these women to eventually reproduce with, and the descendants of women who never used birth control and the men they had children with. Mothers who gave birth at sixteen or who waited until marriage to reproduce would not be able to advise their daughters to be on birth control, and their sons would not be allowed to date any woman who has ever taken

birth control or used a condom (which were not legal in the USA until the late 1940s). In modern-day America, half of all births are unplanned with women who do use contraceptives not always using them 100% of the time when they are not trying to get pregnant, so there is some significant mixing of reproductive strategies going on (Hanson, S.J.). We can't expect our evolution to be as quick as this experiment was because of this inevitable mixing. In a mixed-strategy alien environment, significant genome changes would take much, much longer than the 47 generations it took in a strictly controlled environment.

But let's say it would be just as quick for humans to get the drastic changes in genome and corresponding behaviors and life cycles as it was for *Drosophila*. 47 generations puts us in the year 1082: Europe had finally crawled out of the Dark Ages, Italy was starting to experiment with a new-fangled concept called capitalism, the Song Dynasty in China was working up to its peak which it would achieve in another thirty years, and William the Conqueror, the first Norman monarch of England, sat on the English throne. Had reliable birth control been invented and widely available then, then we might reasonably expect to see some genetically based consequences of it today.

Anyone who states that birth control has had any significant effect on the genetics of humans, their inborn sexual selection preferences, or their behavioral wiring is giving prima facie proof that they have no idea what they are talking about.

Women want Alphas to breed with because women's mate preferences change with their ovulation cycle.

In Red Pill's defense, there was a time when the ovulatory-shift and dual-mating hypothesis seemed to be backed up by the available evidence. Today, this is no longer the case.

Some studies in the late 1990s and early 2000s suggested that ovulating women showed greater preference for more masculine "alpha" men while maintaining a preference for less masculine "beta" men when they were not ovulating (Gangestad, Thornhill; Penton-Voak, et al.). This was such a sexy idea and captivated so much popular attention that researchers threw themselves on the grant-money bandwagon. Speculation ran wild on the internet proclaiming this was proof that women were biologically driven to cheat on their partners when fertile. However, with larger budgets and more data, researchers were unable to reproduce the original results (Harris, Christine; Peters, Marianne; Jones, Benedict C., et al).

One of the larger studies involving 26,000 women showed

that, yes, women got hornier when ovulating, but it had no correlation with mate-retention behavior, narcissism, or clothing choices (Arslan, Ruban). Thiers was not the only study unable to find evidence corroborating the theory that women are more inclined to cheat when fertile (Jones, Benedict C. and Amanda Hahn). Testing the hypothesis that maybe ovulating women were just more inclined towards casual sex rather than outright infidelity than were non-ovulating women also turned out to be false (Thomas, Andrew).

One thing that is important to keep in mind when dealing with scientific data is the concept of reproducibility, or the ability to produce consistent results across multiple studies by multiple researchers all using the same methods as the original study. One small study can result in some very surprising and intriguing results, but if you know how to Science then you know to keep asking questions due to the large number of uncontrollable and largely unknowable 'X-factors' involved when you're dealing with real-world conditions. This is why large studies are considered more reliable than small studies: larger samples mean the chance of random X-factors skewing the data is minimized.

That being said, if an earlier study's conclusions are later unreproducible or proven incorrect, that doesn't mean the original study isn't valuable. Science is about asking questions, and about finding answers. Sometimes the answers researcher get just aren't the answers to the questions they were asking.

For instance, in one of the original studies that kicked off the ovulatory-shift, dual-mating hypothesis, 52 women were asked to smell T-shirts worn by 42 different men. The researchers found that ovulating women preferred the scent of T-shirts worn by men with more symmetrical faces, while non-ovulating women preferred men with less symmetrical faces. The researchers hypothesized that women who are ovulating are more driven to seek out the superior genetics that symmetrical faces represent (Gangestad, Thornhill).

A Swiss zoologist was intrigued by this and decided to do his own smelly T-shirt study using his knowledge of how animals select their mates. Instead of using ovulating vs non-ovulating women, his study used women both on and off hormonal birth control and found a correlation between the women's scent preference and the similarity of their and the men's major histocompatibility locus (MHC, or HLA in humans). MHC is an immune function gene that affects body odor and zoologists have known for some time that some animals use scent pheromones to identify potential mates who have different MHCs from their own. Having parents with different immune system genes means any offspring are likely to have a stronger and more diverse immune

systems than their parents. The zoologists study concluded that, unlike previously believed, humans do respond to scent pheromones. Women on hormonal birth control favored men with MHCs similar to their own, while women not on birth control favored men with MHCs different than their own (Wedekind, Claus, et al.). However, there is no correlation between any measurable alpha-ness and what kind of immune genes a man has. If anything, this discovery is literally saying, "there is someone for everyone." Subsequent and larger studies have successfully reproduced similar results (Roberts, Craig, et al.; Kromer, J. et al.)

It's entirely possible that the small, original smelly T-shirt study got skewed results from the unknown X-factor of MHC. Sometimes—infuriatingly often—doing Science is a journey about figuring out what the question you're actually asking is.

Similarly, a study in 2013 found that ovulating women were more likely to wear red, and this was hypothesized to be a type of fertility-signaling (Beall, Alec). However, when those same researchers attempted to duplicate their findings during a different time of year, they found that women's choice to wear red has a lot more to do with the fact that red is a more fashionable choice for women to wear in the fall and winter than it has to do with signaling fertility (Tracy, Jessica).

The other study destined to ignite the internet was about women's preferences for men's facial features while ovulating and while not ovulating (Penton-Voak, et al.). Men with higher testosterone levels have more pronounced secondary sexual characteristics, including squarer jaws and hollower cheekbones, and this (presumably) would separate the alphas from the betas. This study has been repeated many, many times. Many results have concluded that ovulating women prefer men with more pronounced jawbones and non-ovulating women prefer men with more feminine facial features. Many other studies have said there is no link. The fact that we can't get consistent results is likely telling us that there is one or more currently unknown X-factors mucking up our questions.

However, for the sake of argument, let's throw all that out and work on the assumption that Red Pill is correct and women are more attracted to beta men when less horny and fertile, and more attracted to alpha men when more horny and fertile. Let's also assume that ovulating women are biologically driven to cheat on their beta partners with alpha men. Red Pill's prescription is for men to become more alpha in order to capitalize on the maximum horniness and potential towards promiscuity that ovulating women are capable of.

The way hormonal birth control works is by preventing

ovulation and keeping women in a hormonal state which mimics pregnancy. Ninety-eight percent of American women have used birth control at some point in their lives, with the most common form being the hormonal pill (Hanson, S.J.) Among currently sexually active women not seeking pregnancy, contraceptive use is 84-91%, depending on cultural and economic background (Collins, Emily). For Red Pill's target demographic of peak sexual marketplace value women (women in their twenties), sixty-two percent of all of them use birth control, including those seeking pregnancy, already pregnant, or not sexually active (Daniels, K).

If Red Pill is correct about women being more attracted to alpha men when ovulating and beta men when not ovulating, and the majority of high-value-women are taking hormonal birth control to not ovulate, then the logical course of action to be more attractive to these women would be… to become more beta?

Let's really think about this idea of women being motivated to cheat on their beta men with alpha men. The whole reason women supposedly do this is because alpha men have better genetics than beta men. But is securing superior genetics actually an evolutionary pressure that women have experienced? Or is this simply a male-centric motivation that Red Pill has projected upon women?

Red Pill has this odd pair of blinders on when it comes to sex and can't seem to get its head wrapped around the concept of sex in ancestral peoples being used for anything other than procreation. Red Pill sees modern women fawning over muscular hunka-hunks of man-meat alphas and can't understand what they get out of it besides the reproduction potential, so Red Pill assumes that women have evolved to crave those "good genes" that, apparently, Red Pill thinks alphas have. They take it as proof. It's a good theory, and it makes sense, but it breaks down under scrutiny.

If women's sexual behavior was actually driven primarily by reproduction, then we'd be one of the many, many species who just goes into heat once a year. Or once a month when ovulating. Yet, women are sexually receptive throughout their cycles. That's an evolutionary adaptation that you won't find in lions or tigers and it's an adaptation that is not explained by Red Pill theory.

What is the true bottleneck of reproduction? We know it's women—but is the limitation truly just the difference in energy production to make a billion sperm versus a few eggs? No—the *most* limiting factor to produce healthy offspring that will go on to create their own healthy offspring is what creates the bottleneck. The most limiting factor is always the costliest, and that factor is parental investment in species who parentally invest. In most species, females

are almost always guaranteed a shot at reproduction—they represent the limiting factor, while males have to compete for the lady's favor and, despite their efforts, may still not get chosen by a mate. This puts immense evolutionary pressure on males to reproduce, but considerably less so on females.

This is called Bateman's principle: the biological principle where an asymmetry in male and female reproductive pressures will lead to sexual dimorphism in the sex with a greater pressure. Specifically, female reproduction is limited by access to resources and male reproduction is limited by access to females. A successful male can sire many offspring from many females, thus disproportionately taking away mating opportunities from other males. However, a reproductively successful female cannot take reproductive opportunities away from other females. This leads to competition amongst the males for females and also leads to choosier females who don't bother to expend energy competing with one another. Since there is greater pressure on the male (competition both for the limited resource and against other males), we can expect to see sexual dimorphism play out more in the male than the female. This is why so many males of species are showier—male lions have big manes, male peacocks have bright feathers. The level at which this behavior and physical manifestation is seen is proportional to how much asymmetry there is. In monogamous species, there is very little if any asymmetry, but in non-monogamous species it is more and more apparent the further from monogamy they get. Some species even have these rolls reversed: in seahorses, it's the male who provides all the parenting and post-fertilization care. Female seahorses compete for males, and it's the males that are the choosy, and thus bottleneck, sex. Male seahorses prefer larger females, and so we see a sexual dimorphism where the females are larger than the males (Mattle, Beat).

What we're seeing here is that males and females have different evolutionary pressures shaping their behavior and mating strategies. It's not just a flat evolutionary pressure to reproduce—it's a pressure to obtain the thing that's the most difficult to obtain that is keeping them from reproducing. For males that limiting factor is females, but for females that limiting factor is resources. Men are primarily driven to have sex—that's the thing their mating strategy is limited by (available females), but women have not experienced that particular evolutionary pressure. Women almost always have the opportunity to have sex. Women are driven to secure provisioning.

Considering the very real risk of losing the provisioning she has from her beta male if she's caught, how on earth could a set strategy of infidelity in favor of non-contributing alphas develop in

women when the cost of parental investment is so high? Remember—her evolutionary pressure isn't to secure the best genetics from her mate, it's to ensure *her* genetics get passed on and survive. The woman isn't playing to win for a man's genetics, she's playing to win for her own. A woman who secures provisioning wins, even if the male offers inferior genetics, because *her* genetics are getting passed on and are surviving to adulthood. A woman who risks that provisioning by hooking up with an alpha isn't just putting the alpha's high-quality DNA at risk, she's putting her own previous children and her own life at risk. Until the modern age of cars and internet, a woman's social world was typically a lot smaller than it is now and being caught cheating on her man didn't just risk her relationship with that man, but also with his extended family and friends, not to mention the future costs of securing a new beta now that her wandering tendencies have been exposed. For the vast majority of history there was not a whole lot of immigration going on and so a cheating woman could not count on a steady influx of new betas who did not know her problematic history to dupe, so she would be severely reducing her own, her current dependent children, and all her future children's prospects of survival. That's a hell of a gamble to make when the payoff is a slightly-higher-quality offspring than the faithful woman who can confidently keep herself and her slightly-lower-quality kids alive. It seems highly unlikely that this strategy would win out, consistently, throughout the many, many generations needed to make this sort of strategy a permanent part of women's biological wiring.

But if she can pull it off and get the superior genetics from the alpha and dupe the beta into raising the alpha's kid, then she's *really* winning.

Okay, fair enough. Maybe, somehow, this strategy managed to be overall beneficial to the women who practiced it and so their alpha-seed-beta-need genes got passed on more than other women's genes. How could we test this theory? Well, if the reason for alpha-seed infidelity is hypergamy as Red Pill defines it—that is, hypergamy exists for women to be able to secure the best genetics for their offspring—and women incur a potentially high risk for being caught banging an alpha behind her beta's back, then it makes sense that, as Red Pill claims, women are most likely to cheat with alphas when they are ovulating. Why risk losing provisioning if there is no chance of even securing the superior genetics?

According to Red Pill, women are certainly able to perceive when they are ovulating and most fertile (if only unconsciously or subconsciously), and on that point I do not disagree. The studies Red Pill continually points to, which I have cited here, also spell this out

pretty explicitly. Therefore, observing women on modern birth control would be an excellent way to see if this Red Pill theory holds true. After all, birth control eliminates ovulation, eliminates the chance for pregnancy, and should thus eliminate hypergamy in women—or at least the "continual" hypergamy Red Pill has expanded the traditional definition of "hypergamy" to include.

I don't need to quote a study to tell you that birth control does not eliminate women being drawn to attractive, masculine men, nor does it keep women from cheating on their partners. There is something else going on, and Red Pill's alpha-seed beta-need theory doesn't explain it. We will come back to this mating strategy later.

Why do women mate at all points in their fertility cycle? Because women who were able to leverage sex for resources, for comradery, for strengthening social bonds, and for other reasons, did better and successfully passed on their genes more than women who were only open to sex when fertile. Reproduction is actually pretty far down the priority list of things that humans use sex for, but women who were able to utilize sexuality to improve their overall fitness ultimately did better in the game of procreation.

There are other considerations as well that Red Pill doesn't account for. While men typically have few risks and many benefits when it comes to sex, women must grapple with a far more complex cost/benefit analysis. It's not just the cost of pregnancy and provisioning a child that must be weighed, but also the possible risks of saying no. Find any adult woman and give her the following scenario: She is alone--perhaps at a park, a car wash, or out jogging. A man she has never seen before approaches her and says, "Hi, I've been watching you and I think you are very beautiful. Would you like to go with me to get a cup of coffee?" She politely declines. He smiles and says, "Okay, sorry to bother you. Have a good day," and walks away.

Nine times out of ten, what our hypothetical woman feels is *relief*. Being on the receiving end of sexual and romantic advances brings with it very real risks and dangers that must be taken into account when pondering evolutionary theory. I'd wager that roughly 100% of women over the age of sixteen or so has had some initially charming suitor turn into an asshole the moment she turned him down. One minute he's smiling and flirting, the next he's calling her a bitch and telling her to go to hell. Having something other people—particularly people who are larger and stronger than you—want is a very good place to be socially and economically, but it can be a very dangerous place to be physically.

This is in no way meant to be interpreted as "all men who approach women are aggressive assholes." In fact, the vast majority of

men are very polite and respectful towards women, as our hypothetical suitor demonstrates. The point I am attempting to make here is that it does not benefit women, evolutionarily speaking, to assume that any suitor approaching her isn't going to be an aggressive asshole. She loses nothing from respectful men—but has a great deal to lose from assholes, and so over time women must have evolved to always be on guard when dealing with any new man taking a sexual interest in her and to, by default, assume malicious intent until proven otherwise. Had she not developed psychological counter-strategies and defense mechanisms against aggressive, asshole men, then she would have paid a higher price than other women who did, and our hypothetical trusting woman would not have been as successful in raising her children to adulthood.

Red Pill has a strong undercurrent of resentment towards women because women have the abundance of sexual opportunities that men wish they enjoyed. What Red Pill often fails to understand, ironically enough, is that women do not value sex in the same way that men do—how could they? Women live in a different world, a world where they're not nearly as driven to have sex and a world where sex is constantly available. When Red Pill asserts that women have more sexual partners than men (higher "bodycounts") or that they cheat more often than men, it's because these Red Pill men are projecting their fantasies of what they would like to be able to do if given the same sexual opportunities as women. The reality, however, is far from a carefree sexual playground and that reality was no different 200,000 years ago than it is today. The overwhelming majority of suitors a woman has is only interested in making sex happen with her and they are exceptionally motivated to get what they want, some even to the point of coercion and force. In one study of middle and high-school aged girls, researchers found that sexual assault and harassment were so commonplace that the girls accepted it as a fact of life, with one 13-year-old being quoted as saying "They grab you, touch your butt, and try to, like, touch you in the front, and run away, but it's okay, I mean… I never think it's a big thing because they do it to everyone" (Hlavka, Heather).

Sometimes, the risk of pissing the guy off takes a higher priority in her sexual choice than the risks of potential pregnancy. Sometimes, saying yes is the smart thing to do because it avoids the consequences of saying no, be those consequences injury, denial of basic physical needs, or reputational tarnish: "He does, like, touch us, you know? Like, he rubs my leg, the thigh, but none of us told him, told him to stop, you know? But I… I always moved away when he did it. He'd just rub my leg and touch my boobs. And one time when I was over at his house, I asked him for something to eat and he goes,

'Not unless I can touch your boobs.' He does it to everyone, you know. It happens sometimes" (14-year-old girl speaking of her and her friends with a 30-year-old occasional caregiver) (Hlavka, Heather).

Back to our hypothetical woman alone in the park for a moment. One of the more common let-downs a woman in this scenario will reach for is "Oh, you're so sweet! But I have a boyfriend/husband, sorry," even when no such boyfriend or husband exists. Red Pill often considers this a "shit test," or something women do to test the alpha-ness of potential mates (presumably, a true alpha wouldn't care about her other man and would just assume he's attractive enough to pull her away from him anyway and would continue with his courtship), but the truth is that it's a defense mechanism. Even a *hypothetical* boyfriend offers protection from unwanted sexual advances and the inherent risks they bring. A man inclined towards forcing or coercing an unwilling woman into a sexual encounter suddenly has his own cost/benefit analysis to ponder; namely, that he may have to deal with an angry man who will seek to beat him up or even try to kill him later. Women on their own ultimately present little physical risk to men, but other men present a significant risk. Does the benefit of a brief sexual encounter with this potentially unfertile woman outweigh the risk presented by her potentially real protector? Or is there a potentially more profitable venture to be gained with a woman who he knows to not be in a relationship with another man? Or with a woman who cannot identify him to any potential protectors? Women, even today's modern women, learn very early that aggressive, asshole men don't respect women's opinions or consent, but occasionally they do respect another man's property. If an actual man had been with her in the park, it's highly unlikely her suitor, respectful or otherwise, would have approached her at all.

When women are in an environment where they are the target of regular sexual advances from men, and where occasionally saying yes is the smart thing to do in order to avoid the consequences of saying no, then the even smarter thing to do is to say yes long-term to a man who will ward off other men. This is the evolutionary benefit of male mate-guarding, which Red Pill seems to primarily consider a beta male strategy to ensure paternity *despite* female hypergamy. In truth, male mate-guarding benefits women more than men because of the risks that being the gender in demand brings. This could be considered a type of reciprocal altruism: men offer women protection from the sexual advances of other men and in return enjoy exclusive sexual access to that woman, and in return the woman provides more sexual opportunities to the man than he would be able to achieve otherwise while enjoying more social and physical freedom than she would be able to secure on her own. Her overall fitness is increased

because the amount of potentially risky encounters she has is greatly reduced. Meanwhile, his chance of passing on his genes has gone up considerably because he is enjoying regular sexual access that, presumably, he wouldn't have been able to get without offering the mate-guarding. Mate guarding doesn't cock-block the women—it cock-blocks other men.

The take-away here is that sexual behavior, human or otherwise, is a constant push-and-pull negotiation between the sexes and nothing exists in a vacuum devoid of the other sex's behavior. Everything is in a state of constant negotiation, seeking an equilibrium between competing agendas.

The majority of men out there are not hooking up much, if at all. Only 20% of men really have options when it comes to sex, the rest of men are shit out of luck.

Part of Red Pill's claim about women's unchecked hypergamy is that only a small percentage of men are actually having most of the sex available, and that percentage is dominated by the alpha males that women are driven to mate with because of hypergamy. This is an essential logical prediction of the alpha-seed beta-need theory. If Red Pill is correct and women are driven to have sex with alphas and not betas, and birth control has upended the social rules so that women's hypergamy is now free to run wild and unchecked in a free sexual marketplace, then we should see a majority of women choosing to have sex with a minority of men.

This is called the Pareto Principle, or the 80/20 rule. It was originally used to explain how in Italy, 80% of the nation's wealth is owned by 20% of the nation's citizens, but has been used commonly as a rule of thumb to explain disproportional cause and consequence scenarios. For instance, among law enforcement it would be considered more or less accurate to say that 20% of the criminals commit 80% of the crimes, while the remaining 80% of criminals only occasionally dabble in crime. The Pareto Principle is more an overall concept than an actual hard-and-fast number rule, and it is common amongst Red Pill advocates to hear that women are only attracted to the top 20%, 10%, or 5% of men and the rest are betas that women don't see as fuckable. The actual percentages don't really matter, only that the data shows that only a minority of men are reporting a majority of sexual pairings. If it were true, then this would be some pretty solid evidence that alpha-seed beta-need is a thing and that female hypergamy as Red Pill defines it is the truth of human nature. Within Red Pill, it is gospel.

First, I am going to explain how this claim by Red Pill cannot

possibly be accurate given how science works, and then I am going to explain why it's so incredibly accurate that it's actually totally wrong. Red Pill's 80/20 concept is based entirely on facts, but their interpretation is based on inductive reasoning and is flawed.

If women consistently, over time, have cucked betas in order to breed with alphas, then why the heck do we have any betas left? Remember the rules of the game: what you see is what you get. If Red Pill is correct and the human population is made up of roughly 80% betas and 20% alphas, then by default we must assume that the beta mating strategy is the vastly more effective one. Species do not evolve for the betterment of the species—species evolve for the success of the genes. Genes don't care about what is good for the species or good for the individual, genes only care about what gets them into more bodies. Beta males did not evolve on a species-wide-level in order to give alpha babies a better chance at survival and so improve humankind through supposedly superior alpha genetics—that is ridiculous, and simply not how evolution works. Such gullibility in beta males would be *severely* punished in natural selection. If there is any basic genetic difference between betas and alphas—which Red Pill claims there is if they're claiming that alphas have superior genetics that women want—and if we have far more betas than alphas, then science demands that we come up with a theory as to why betas are so superior to alphas in their reproductive strategy. If alpha-seed beta-need were the correct model, then we should have something closer to 80% alphas and 20% betas.

Furthermore, for as much as Red Pill obsesses over pair bonding, it seems to fail to understand that alpha-seed beta-need and the 80/20 rule are incompatible with human pair bonding even existing in the first place (Gavrilets, Sergey).

Human pair bonding is not unique in the primate world, as monogamous primate species who pair bond exist. However, none of human's closest primate relatives (chimpanzees, bonobos, gorillas, and orangutans) pair bond like humans do. The closest thing any of them have to a pair bond on human levels is the bonobo, and that is a mother/son relationship. This means that the way humans pair bond with their mates is a recent evolutionary adaptation. It came about after our split from the human/chimp/bonobo common ancestor we all shared because proto-humans who pair-bonded did a much better job of passing their genes onto the next generation than did non-pair-bonding proto-humans. If alpha-seed beta-need is truly women's biologically ingrained mating strategy, if women have consistently chosen temporary mating liaisons with sexy alphas over their doting betas, then how the heck did humans evolve to pair bond in the first

place?

If the most successful mating strategy for human men was to be an alpha and spend their time and resources having sex with lots of women while committing to none, then how did genes hard-wired to pair bond and commit end up in humans? If Red Pill is correct, then what we should have is what we see in lions or gorillas: a whole bunch of males not at all interested in doting on females or committing to one female and only interested in fighting with all the other males to become the next alpha. Lions and gorillas are not hard wired by their biology to pair bond in the way humans are because pair bonding is not a trait being selected for in the lion and gorilla sexual marketplace. They're wired for one, not the other, and that is a result of hundreds and thousands of generations of mate selection.

If women are driven to have sex with alphas in order to get their sperm and have stronger, genetically superior children—then where are all the alphas?

If only the top 20% of men are fuckable and desired by women, then why are the other 80% of the genes the ones who are most represented in the human species? Any theory about how human sexual strategies came to evolve must account for the consequences of its own theories, and Red Pill's alpha-seed beta-need theory does not match the evidence we see today. Any theory must also account for how pair-bonding evolved so recently in our species' lineage, and nothing in Red Pill's theories offers an explanation for how humans came to be a pair bonding species. If alpha-seed beta-need were the correct model, if women were truly driven to go out and bang alphas they hadn't pair-bonded with when ovulating and the most successful males were the ones who never bothered to pair-bond, then Mr. Alpha-I-Don't-Do-Commitment-Seed would, literally, win, and his strategy would become the dominant one for the human species. It didn't. We're a pair-bonded species. If alpha-seed beta-need were the correct model, then pair-bonding would represent a huge disincentive for males to develop, as it would inhibit them from executing the more successful alpha mating strategy. In humans, most men are highly driven to pair-bond with the women they intend to reproduce with. Thus, women simply have not demonstrated a historically significant mating preference for alpha man-whores who are not inclined to pair bond. The most successful mating strategies are the ones that become dominant, and pair-bonding is what we see when we look at human mates. The 80/20 Pareto Principle and Red Pill's alpha-seed beta-need theory is invalid.

Just because an alpha has a kid, doesn't mean that kid will

necessarily be an alpha. Betas can come from alphas and vice versa.

This is another misconception that I come across frequently amongst individuals within the Red Pill community, even though I have not seen it in any of the more official or mainstream literature. Since it seems to be a belief held by a significant percentage of the Red Pill community, I will address it here.

As a literal reading, yes—this statement is correct and there is nothing in genetics that says an alpha "has" to pass on whatever genes makes him an alpha onto his sons. However, over time, and particularly over the amount of time it takes for something like a mating strategy to get solidified into that species' DNA, different rules apply.

Let's use the example of a very simple genetic mutation, blue eyes, to illustrate how over a great deal of time a beneficial mutation becomes dominant in a population even when it is not necessarily passed directly from parent to child. Now, whatever genes that make alphas "alpha" are not going to be as simple as blue eyes, and in fact we are likely dealing with many genes with complex relationships to many other genes, but the basic principle applies.

In humans, you have forty-six chromosomes which each contain hundreds or even thousands of genes. However, the chromosomes are not all unique—we actually have twenty-three pairs of nearly identical chromosome. We get twenty-three chromosomes from our mothers and twenty-three matching chromosomes from our fathers. Each pair of chromosomes holds the same sort of genes in the same place on the chromosome that tell the body what to do, or the "instructions" of how to build a body and how to influence what behaviors that body will have.



However, the different paired chromosomes may have different variations of those genes. For instance, one chromosome, inherited from this person's mother, may say to make blue eyes while the other chromosome, inherited from the father, says to make brown eyes. In this example "blue eyes" and "brown eyes" are alleles, which are the genes that code for the same things, but in different ways.

A person will often possess both sets of instructions in their DNA. How "dominant" or "recessive" these competing alleles are determines whether this person will have blue or brown eyes. When this person, who has competing alleles on different chromosomes, has children, those children have a 50% chance of inheriting a gene for blue eyes and a 50% chance of inheriting a gene for brown eyes. Which one the kid will get is a coin toss, but they will get one of the chromosomes where these alleles reside and their other parent will supply a matched chromosome which may say "blue," "brown," "green," or even "hazel."

For eye color in reality, humans have four total "slots" for alleles and numerous interacting genes with some colors like hazel not even being a separate color but instead a quirk of green combined with a different gene that affects how the iris scatters the light reflected by it, but for simplicity's sake we are going to pretend that eye color is a simple matter of blue eyes or not blue eyes.

Now, blue eyes are "recessive," which means that if there is any competing allele on the other matching chromosome, then the person will not have blue eyes. "Recessive" and "dominant" is kind of

like a game of rock-paper-scissors amongst alleles, except that an allele cannot change its mind—it will always be "paper" and lose to "scissors." Blue eyes are "recessive" to any other eye-color instructions that the other allele may provide. This means that only when both alleles say "blue eyes" will the person have blue eyes. However, they can still give that blue-eye allele to their children, so if they mate with someone who also carries a blue-eye allele, then that person may have children who have blue eyes. Individuals who carry an allele for blue eyes but who do not have blue eyes themselves are called "carriers," but they won't look any different from someone who does not "carry" a blue-eye allele. If a person has two alleles for blue eyes, however, then there are no "dominant" instructions for the blue-eye gene to be "recessive" to, and so the person will have blue eyes. Because they have two copies of the same blue-eye allele, all their children will carry at least one copy of the blue-eye gene. If any of this sounds vaguely familiar, it's because we all had to take a test on it back in high-school biology.

In Figure 1, males are squares and females are circles. White squares and circles are individuals who do not carry a copy of the blue-eye gene mutation. Squares and circles which are half gray are carriers of the blue-eye gene. These individuals do not have blue eyes themselves and look like everyone else, but they can pass the allele onto their children. Solid gray squares and circles are individuals with two sets of the blue-eye gene and they have blue eyes. Since all they have are two copies of the blue gene, they can only pass on blue-eye alleles to their children, so all their children will have at least one copy of the blue-eye gene.

For this illustration, we are going to pretend that blue eyes are beneficial in some way. How are they beneficial? Who the heck knows—it's not actually important. There are several ways that an individual's reproductive health can be improved compared to others in their same species: (1) they can have a higher birth rate. This would occur if some mutation caused women to conceive twins instead of a singleton more often; (2) they can have a longer reproductive career. This means that this individual still reproduces at the same rate as everyone else, but lives longer or reproduces longer than others in their species. Overall, this would result in more children produced over time; or (3) they have the same reproductive rate and lifespan as the other members of their species, but for some reason, more of their children survive into adulthood to reproduce themselves. When a woman can secure a mate to help provide for her children, those children get more food and protection and so have a better chance of surviving into adulthood.

In this example, how blue eyes are beneficial is not important. What is important in this example is that blue eyes are beneficial to the reproductive health of the blue-eyed individual and that blue eyes are consistently beneficial over a large period of time. If, for instance, blue eyes allow an individual to have more children because blue things happen to be worshiped or considered divine by the society it mutated into, but that society is taken over by raiders two hundred years later and the raiders don't show a preference for blue over any other eye color, then blue eyes will not have the opportunity to become dominant in the society. Blue eyes will just be a flash in the pan and will likely die out over time. It is only when the mutation provides some sort of consistent reproductive benefit that it is able to establish a genetic foothold in the specie's DNA and become more and more common, and potentially even dominant, over time. Things like the fact that humans all have eyes, no matter the color, is evidence that eyes are a highly successful and beneficial gene that has, over many, many, many generations, become dominant and universal in our DNA. When a mutation like the tendency to pair bond permeates all cultures of humans, this is also evidence of a highly beneficial mutation that has been consistently favored over many, many, many generations.

For our illustration in Figure 1, we are going to pretend that a single mutation has happened to one of a man's two eye color alleles in a population that has never had blue eyes before. While neither of his parents had blue eyes or carried a blue-eye allele, for whatever reason, this guy mutated a whole new eye color in one of his chromosomes. Because blue eyes are recessive, this allele doesn't do anything and just kind of sits there for a few generations, randomly being passed down as our mutated patient-zero reproduces. To save space, we will simply not follow the lineage of any non-carriers and will assume that any reproductive partners being brought into this family do not carry a blue-eye allele. After the blue-eye gene gets into a few more bodies, a pair of distant cousins who both happen to be carriers decide to get together and make some babies. One of those babies hits the genetic jackpot and inherits a blue-eye allele from both parents, making him the very first blue-eyed person this society has ever seen. Because we are pretending that blue eyes are beneficial, we are going to say that while non-blue-eyed people typically have two children who survive to adulthood, any blue-eyed individual will be lucky enough to have three.



Figure 1

As you can see, beneficial alleles become more common over time. This figure only covers ten generations—a mere two-hundred years. If one group of people, say those with blue eyes, consistently have more children than those who do not, then those genes will

eventually, over hundreds of generations, become dominant. If you were to put this model into a computer program and let it run for three hundred or so generations, then all alleles for anything other than blue eyes will disappear from the DNA of this society. Only so many individuals can be supported by a given environment (there is never an infinite amount of food, space, or other resources), so less successful alleles will simply be crowded out by more successful ones. This is why they are called "competing alleles," since the two versions of the same information (blue eyes or not-blue eyes) are competing against each other. For a far more thorough explanation of how this works in long-term evolutionary selection, I recommend reading Richard Dawkins' *The Selfish Gene*. The Youtube channel *Primer* also offers several informative videos that show visual computer programs which operate on this principle.

While it is entirely true that an individual "alpha" may or may not end up with sons who are also alphas, over a large amount of time any mating strategy that consistently produces more offspring that survive to reproduce *will* become more common in the population than strategies that produce fewer offspring. With enough time and enough generations, the winning strategy *will* become dominant in the species. It is simply how evolution works.

Back to the 80/20 principle: If we take any data from surveys asking men how many previous sexual partners they have had, we see that a small minority of men are reporting a majority of the pairings. In the *Relationships in America* survey data, approximately 20% of men ages 25-50 are reporting 70% of the sexual partners, which means that 80% of men are left with only 30% of the sexual pairings. This particular survey interviewed nearly 15,000 Americans and was conducted by a research firm which specializes in producing high-quality data suitable for academic projects. The Pareto Principle, as applied to actual data, holds.

Now, the 80/20 principle *as Red Pill interprets it* contains an immediate logical fallacy: Red Pill has taken the data that roughly 20% of the men are reporting 70% of the total reported number of sexual relationships and then from that has inferred that 20% of the men are having sex with 70% of the women.

Do you see the problem yet? In order for this assumption to be true, we must also assume that roughly 100% of the women are having roughly equal amounts of sex. Already we have a problem with Red Pill's interpretation of the data: virgins exist, and highly prolific prostitutes exist, with most women positioned somewhere in between.

The truth is, the Pareto Principle is such a universally useful rule that we find it applies to both men *and* women. When we look at

the data from women age 25-50, we see that 20% of women are reporting 65% of total reported sexual partners. This does not mean that 20% of women are having sex with 65% of men, as Red Pill logic would imply. The same survey tells us that roughly 80% of both heterosexual men and women report nine or fewer total lifetime sexual partners, while less than 10% are reporting more than 30 total lifetime sexual partners and only 2-3% are reporting 50 or more lifetime sexual partners. Roughly half of both men and women report 3 or fewer total lifetime partners. Taken as a whole, it is far more logical to deduce that there is simply a great deal of sexual pairings happening within 20% of the population.

Said in another way, the most promiscuous men and women (men and women with more unrestricted sociosexuality, which is a term we will hear again later) are hooking up with each other, while those with more reserved attitudes about sex (who have more restrictive sociosexuality) are hooking up with partners who also have more reserved attitudes about sex. Which is exactly what you would expect to find in a free sexual marketplace in a species where pair bonding and monogamy is (more or less) the norm. There is no evidence whatsoever to suggest that a majority of women are having sex with a minority of men. The 80/20 rule as Red Pill has interpreted it, and the alpha-seed beta-need theory Red Pill claims as irrefutable truth is, in fact, a lie. It's ideology—it's imagination, speculation, and belief, but not fact. Red Pill's "truths" are not supported by the data—not even the data that Red Pill itself points to.

Studies show that way more men ages 18-30 are having no sex versus same-age women. Who are the women having sex with if not with alphas their own age or alphas over 30? They're certainly not having sex with men 18-30.

In 2018 a graph showing data from the *General Social Survey* (GSS) of that year began to circulate heavily within Red Pill communities. It showed a sharp rise in self-reported sexlessness within the last year for both men and women, but a disproportionately sharper rise for men. Specifically, it showed that in 2008 10% of men and 8% of women reported not having sex within the past year. In 2018 those numbers rose to 28% for men and 18% for women.

A 10% difference is very different from a 2% difference, and warrants some investigation.

Looking into it, I found that the same GSS survey in 2021 shows these numbers dropping for men to 19% and climbing for women to 23%. For comparison, in 2000 these numbers were right at 15% for both men and women. Similar data from other surveys,

specifically the National Survey of Family Growth and the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, both show overall declining rates of male sexlessness from 2010 on (IFS).

For whatever reason, there was a blip in the data in GSS's 2018 survey which has not persisted in subsequent surveys by the same institute and which did not show up in similar surveys within the same time period. This is another example of the importance of reproducibility in science—a single data point does not equal conclusive evidence of anything, and historically this survey data does show a good bit of fluctuation with women sometimes showing higher sexlessness rates than men and men sometimes showing higher sexlessness rates than women. When investigated, there isn't anything to back up this claim by Red Pill. There really isn't anything here to report at all, other than the fact that roughly equal percentages of men and women are abstaining, for whatever reason, from sex.

Women often give the PC answer. I think they understate how many sexual partners they've had.

Back when I was a cop, if I thought a witness was lying then it was up to me to prove that they were doing so. In fact, even if I thought a witness was telling the truth it was still my job to provide supporting evidence to show why it was reasonable to believe the witness's account.

As I have shown many times in this book, Red Pill has the very bad habit of taking any shred of evidence that supports its preconceived ideologies at face value, generally with the result that the details and nuances and totality of that evidence actually disproves the very points Red Pill is trying to make. Meanwhile, any time evidence that questions its ideology comes up, that evidence is dismissed outright. Particularly when that evidence is from women, and very often from the very same surveys and sources where Red Pill took the men's responses at face value.

"Women lie all the time" or "women have a rationalization hamster in their heads churning out twisted versions of reality" are both very common retorts in the Red Pill community—and they're right. Women lie all the time. So do men. Women do have a rationalization hamster in their heads. So do men. Red Pill is misogynistic because instead of working to prove women's evidence wrong beyond a reasonable doubt, Red Pill instead comes up with a reasonable reason why these women might lie, and then assumes that because a reasonable reason exists, that the women must be lying. The same standard is not held for men.

But, an allegation has been made and so we shall investigate.

Nonscientific surveys have many X-factors that reduce their data's usefulness and credibility. Straw polls and other nonscientific surveys are based on indiscriminate collections of people's opinions and responses, while responsible surveys are based on scientific methods of sampling, data collection, and analysis. However, because nonscientific polls are so easy to do, their results flood the market and are often confused with more legitimate and representative scientific surveys.

For example, virtually every toothpaste commercial from every toothpaste brand claims that it is the number one toothpaste recommended by "nine out of ten dentists." It is statistically impossible for 90% of dentists to agree that one toothpaste is the #1 best, and also for 90% of dentists to agree that a different toothpaste is the #1 best. In reality, the toothpaste marketing team did not attempt to survey a representative sample of all dentists: they only asked the dentists on their market research payroll list to participate in their survey. Guess which one out of ten dentists isn't going to be invited to the company's Hawaii vacation retreat next year?

Radio, television, magazine, and web sites love to host self-selecting polls because they encourage customer participation and engagement. They offer wonderful entertainment value, but should not be presented as serious or objective measures of public opinion. When I say self-selecting, what I mean is that instead of approaching a random sample of people who may or may not be interested in the poll, it requires the people participating in the poll to take an active role in initiating participation with the poll. Right off the bat, self-selecting polls beg for a selection bias and when it comes to the topic of sex, they get it: Volunteers in self-selected sex surveys tend to be more sexually experienced, are more sensation and attention seeking, and have more relaxed sexual attitudes towards sex than those of the general population (Catania, Joseph; Dunne, MP; Strassburg, DS).

Nonscientific studies are also prone to high levels of bias. One of the key components of scientific data is that it has been through a peer-review process, which is when many people with the educational background needed to understand whatever it is the researchers are studying all look and provide feedback of every facet of the researcher's work—from the wording of the questions being asked, to the sampling strategy of the people being asked the questions, to the conclusions drawn by the researchers. Personal bias doesn't go away just because a person earns the credentials to become a scientist—the removal of personal bias comes from the critiques of a diverse group of people who do not all hold the same biases.

The first sex survey published in the USA was F.S. Brockman's

survey of adolescent boys. Brockman believed that masturbation depleted a man's energy. College-aged men were asked about their childhoods: "What was your severest temptation?" "Did you yield?" Not surprisingly, Brockman found what he was looking for: men were in spiritual crisis, and masturbation was to blame (Boxer). Had this researcher submitted his work to peers with fewer puritanical beliefs, he may have been made aware that framing his questions in a way that assumes a spiritual connection and a right/wrong answer clues his interviewees into the kind of answers desired, and pressures them into giving him exactly what he wants lest they be judged by the man sitting in front of them.

The typical nonscientific sex survey in America will show that men have sex with three-to-four times as many women as women have with men—specifically, that women average seven previous sex partners and men average thirty (Liddle, Rod). This is a statistical impossibility.

There are several explanations for why nonscientific polls show this consistent discrepancy. First, it's possible that everyone is telling the truth and it's just that the outliers are not being counted. For instance, if it's true that men are averaging thirty partners each and all these women are averaging seven partners each, then for every nineteen women surveyed it's possible there is a twentieth woman not participating in the survey who has four-hundred and sixty-seven partners. She was probably unavailable to participate in the survey because she was too busy meeting her quota. Likewise, it's possible that large flocks of male virgins run like hell, weeping and ashamed, when approached by scary female researchers.

Another possibility is the result of gender-specific interpretations of what constitutes a "sexual partner." It's possible that women are only counting full intercourse, while men are counting every time they got to second base.

The last possible explanation is the one usually assumed as the most likely: both men and women are lying through their teeth and giving answers based on what is socially acceptable, rather than what is factual. The discrepancies found would then be the result of men's tendency to exaggerate and women's fear of derogatory labelling. Red Pill often assumes the latter, while rarely acknowledging the former.

Credible and scientific studies take pains to limit their X-factors as much as possible. They train their interviewers to appear impassive and non-judgmental. The wording of questions is scrutinized by teams of people looking for bias before any interviewee sees them. Sensitive questions are asked both orally and in writing and individuals whose answers show discrepancies are discounted

from the final data. Even very simple techniques applied to already-gathered nonscientific self-selecting polls in which women reported 7 partners and men reported 14 got the gender discrepancy down from a difference of 7 partners to a difference of 2.63 partners (Mitchell, Kirstin R. et al.).

In 1992, the most anticipated, comprehensive, and scientific sex survey to date made a very anti-climactic splash when it reported low rates of promiscuity and high levels of marital fidelity. It showed that most Americans had only one sexual partner in the previous year and that, for the most part, they were happy about it. It showed the median (not the average) number of lifetime sexual partners for women was 2 and was 6 for men (Laumann, Edward O).

More recent scientific sexual surveys, such as the *Relationships in America* report and the *National Survey of Family Growth* surveys I reference, give us even more detail, nuance, and accuracy than ever before. Scientific methods have, in fact, been able to get the self-reported gender discrepancy of the number of lifetime sexual partners down to a level that is statistically within the realm of possibility. Today's scientific surveys report average lifetime numbers of sexual partners for both men and women hover around 7.2, with a median of about 4 - 6. While men do still overall report more sexual partners than women (or vice versa), the differences when organized into groups (1-2 partners, 5-9 partners, 10-15 partners, etc.) are statistically within an acceptable margin of error (Haderxhanaj, Laura T, et al.).

The reason why the median is always lower than the average comes down to a small percentage of highly promiscuous men and women who drive up the average, as we've already discussed. If ten people report lifetime sexual partners of 1, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5, 6, 6, 6, and 30, then the average number of sexual partners for these people will be 7, but the median will be 5. When small percentages of a population are extreme outliers, the median will generally show a more accurate representation of what is "normal" for that population.

Red Pill's extreme willingness to accept certain data as irrefutable proof when it upholds its preconceived ideas and extreme willingness to dismiss certain data when it challenges those preconceived ideas is not evidence of a scientifically objective and critical mindset. It is evidence of intellectual laziness and bias.

The Very First Beta Male

"It is remarkable how similar the pattern of love is to the pattern of insanity."

- Merovingian, *The Matrix Revolutions* (2003)

The main theory now for why humans evolved to be so smart (besides aliens tinkering with our DNA) is that we were gradually driven out of the trees and had to establish a niche in the grass. Researchers believe that by about 3 million years ago, proto-humans were walking upright, but still sleeping in the trees (Ruff, CB). Whatever common ancestor we shared then with chimps, gorillas, and bonobos stayed in those trees, eventually splitting later into their own distinct species. Proto-humans had to get smarter, with bigger brains, to survive in this new niche with so few hiding spaces. Today the Smithsonian lists the earliest known stone tools dating from 2.6 million years ago, and it's almost certain that non-stone tools were in use for much longer before our ancestors developed the know-how to make tools that would survive the eons for us to find.

The more time we spent standing and walking upright (likely because it required fewer calories than moving on four limbs), the more women's hip diameter was gradually restricted. If our kids were going to have big brains, this required our children to be born earlier and less developed, thus requiring more time and more intensive care to rear. Humans are now one of the few species on the planet with such a long childrearing time that we routinely rear children simultaneously from different pregnancies, rather than waiting until the older child is at least largely independent of the parents before reproducing again.

Monogamy is an evolutionary adaptation. Men willing to stick close and provide had children who were more likely to survive to adulthood and reproduce themselves. In any species where the offspring's needs can be met by one parent, it is almost always to the other parent's genetic benefit to leave and attempt to reproduce with another mate in order to increase their own reproductive success. Only when the cost of leaving is so high as to risk their reproductive fitness do both parents evolve the tendency to stick around and invest in the children. In mammals, it is the female who is exploited into investing more into the children than the male. Even if the female were to leave, she has already put a great deal of investment into the

pregnancy while the male has invested little. The male can abandon the child with relatively little loss of investment, as it will only take mating with another female and waiting a bit to replace the investment he lost with the loss of the first child. However, the mother will have to not only mate but also go through a whole other pregnancy. This includes all the resources and risk to herself during that pregnancy in order to get a new child to the same level that the lost child was at the time of its death.

Because mammalian females invest more at all stages of reproduction, she is expected to continue to invest more in the future as a hedge against losing her previous high investment. If it is beneficial for the male to cut and run, then that is what the male of the species will do. However, in aquatic species it is often the reverse that is true. Paternal primary investment is far more common in fish than in mammals and this is attributed to the mechanics of fertilization. In aquatic species, females release eggs into the water. The male then swims over and fertilizes the eggs. This is all done externally in the water, which is impossible for mammals to do because of how sensitive eggs and sperm are to drying out. Because the male fish dare not release his sperm before the female releases her eggs, it is the female who has a few seconds' opportunity while the male is releasing sperm to abandon the offspring before the male can. While the female's investment at this point is still larger than the male's since her eggs are larger and more costly than sperm, she has still only invested little and can quickly recoup any loss of investment. Also, the male fish can reasonably meet the needs of the offspring on his own, so her abandonment does not necessarily mean a loss of investment. If the male were to also leave after the female, however, then his investment will most certainly be lost. Because both sexes' investment are roughly equal (in other words, they are both small), it is because the male's risk of losing investment is larger that causes male fish to evolve the tendency for males to primarily invest in parental care over females. I have stated all this simply to say that there is no moral high ground offered for one gender over the other. If one sex can get away with exploiting the other, they will, and they do. It's how evolution works. Strategies that best exploit whatever niche is available for exploitation are the ones that drive evolution.

Red Pill says that for humans, alpha-seed beta-need describes human mating strategies where women want alphas to breed with and someone else (or also the alpha) to provide for her, while the men want to be alphas and not have to worry about providing for anyone. If this were the pattern we followed, then we'd have something like gorillas or chimps have now—where there is an alpha male who does little if any providing and any beta males have limited, if any, mating

rights. All those betas are just biding their time before they can exploit an opportunity to become an alpha. They're not showing any *different* mating strategy from the alphas. Although they may sneak in a quickie with a receptive female every once in a while, they're not playing the doting simp as Red Pill describes the typical beta doing in order to attract women. The female gorillas and chimps need to provide for most of their own provisioning, so they never got the opportunity to evolve more helpless children that take longer to become independent.

Too many logical problems pop up with the alpha-seed beta-need model. Like—where do the betas come from? In chimps, all the betas are really alphas-in-waiting. They're not different, it's just not their turn to be alpha yet. Chimps don't have alpha-seed beta-need because they don't have betas. Since alpha is the preferred male, only alpha genes and the proclivity for alpha mating strategies get passed on.

Infanticide by adult males who are not the father of the children being killed is a widespread mating strategy, particularly amongst primates, meant to remove competition for female resources. By killing a female's dependent children, a male can induce her to ovulate more quickly than she normally would if the children were to live. This not only gives him an opportunity to mate more quickly than he otherwise would, but ensures her attention and resources will be focused on his progeny and not another male's offspring (Borries, C).

This is a particularly unpleasant reality, but it's important to stress again that genes don't care about the individual. Genes don't care about the species. Genes don't care if the bodies they inhabit are healthy or happy or morally righteous. Genes are the ultimate pragmatists—they are in fact ruthless pragmatics—and genes don't give a crap about anything but getting themselves into more bodies. If killing unrelated babies of your own species means making more related babies that hold your genes, then that strategy is going to win out over less successful strategies that don't get as many copies of their genes into new babies. If getting yourself killed and eaten means you pass on your genes on to more babies, as is the case of the male praying mantis, then that is the evolutionary strategy that is going to eventually dominate your species.

There are also a number of ways this infanticide strategy can manifest. In primates, it manifests with the adult male actively attacking and killing the child he is not related to. In mice, males secrete a chemical that, when smelled by a pregnant female, causes her to abort, but only when the smell is different from the male she

previously mated with. The mouse's way of going about infanticide is a little easier to stomach, but the end result and the reason it evolved is the same.

The primary factor that correlates with whether or not a species will evolve infanticide by males as a reproductive strategy is the ability of females to reproduce year-round. That is, a lack of a seasonal or yearly "breeding season" (Lukas, Dieter). The second most common factor for evolving infanticide by males is stable mixed-sex social groups, or a social organization where multiple males and multiple females have daily interactions. Humans obviously have both of these and it's very reasonable to expect that infanticide by males as a reproductive strategy was practiced regularly by early human ancestors. Infanticide by adult males is widespread in primates today, including our more closely related cousins: gorillas and chimpanzees, where it has been heavily documented. In another closely related primate species, orangutans, infanticide by adult males has never been directly observed, but the females of the species display common physiological and psychological adaptations for infanticide avoidance. Some observed instances involving missing orangutan offspring also indicates infanticide by adult males (Knott, C.D).

In Bonobos, the absence of infanticide as a male mating strategy sticks out amongst primates so much that many researchers have proffered theories for its conspicuous absence, often citing the defense against infanticide by males as the primary driver for the female-dominated society observed in bonobos today (Gottfried, H; Walker, K.) The take-away here is that among primates, the absence of this mating strategy by adult males is highly conspicuous and any evolutionary theory as to how modern human mating strategies evolved needs to include an explanation for its lack in human primates. Red Pill does not offer this.

This will take a minute so stay with me: my theory is that we started somewhere similar to where gorillas and lions are now—a mating strategy based on an alpha male dynamic mating with multiple females. Infanticide by alpha males who are not the father of the children would have been a regular occurrence, as it is now in gorilla and lion societies.

Then, a beta mutation happened somehow in one male. I imagine this beta was able to knock off an older alpha who had a small harem, or maybe even just a single female. This female would already have a kid or kids and I imagine, for this scenario to work, she'd have to be a bit older. Old enough to have given birth at least twice. This is a female that would have had to have seen the last alpha kill her child and will have had to suffer that loss after that alpha stole

her from another alpha. Now—hold that thought.

To understand this dynamic, you need to understand the common counter-strategies females develop in species with regular infanticide. Female lions only go into heat when ovulating, but she will regularly sneak out and away from her alpha in order to mate with neighboring alphas and loner males who are just out and about.

Why is she doing this? Ask any Red Pill advocate, and you will quickly hear them proclaim "Alpha-seed beta-need and female hypergamy!" with a glee in their voice akin to a teenager hitting the high score on their favorite video game. But let's really look at this female lion's motivations—is she really looking for superior genes? How does she know she's getting genes superior to what she's got at home? Female lions have an alpha at home, and one who presumably gave her an up-close demonstration of his sheer alpha-ness and genetic superiority when he took over the pride. Why sneak around? Why hook up with the loner bad-boy who hasn't even got a pride and thus isn't even really an alpha, much less a genetically superior one?

The reality is, this lioness doesn't care about who the father of her children are—she just knows that males don't kill the cubs of females they've mated with recently. When Red Pill describes alpha-seed beta-need, what they are actually describing, although they don't realize it, is a female adaptation to avoid infanticide by adult males, not a strategy to secure superior genetics (Palombit, Ryne A).

Red Pill is viewing female behavior through a very male lens because Red Pill is assuming females are subject to male reproductive pressures. They are not—they are subject to female reproductive pressures, which primarily revolve around keeping her children alive, not around securing the best genetics for them.

Males who evolve a reproductive strategy of killing children also need to simultaneously evolve a reluctance to killing children who might be related to them, otherwise he risks killing his own offspring. Any male who just willy-nilly kills any baby he comes across is highly likely to prevent his own progeny from ever successfully growing up and having offspring of their own, and his genes will rightfully die out.

By banging as many nearby males as she can, our female lion is ensuring that her genetics—her cubs—survive the next changing of the guard (the next alpha takeover) because all the likely new-alpha prospects in the area will have recently mated with her. She wants to mate with as many nearby males as possible because her alpha isn't going to last forever. He will be overthrown. It's only a matter of time, and if she hasn't mated with the next guy *before* he takes over her

pride, then he will kill her children (Agrell, Jep, et al.; Palombit, Ryne A.). This female lion has no real choice on whether she is going to get pregnant or not—it's going to happen—but her genes have immense pressure on surviving the next alpha takeover, so she is doing what she can to keep her children alive.

This example is what I mean when I say females have little evolutionary pressure to reproduce—this lioness is going to reproduce. She is going to go into heat and there is going to be a male nearby. Her only agency is who the nearby male sperm donor is going to be. She can choose to just accept the main alpha and have only his children, or she can choose to go and bang a whole bunch of nearby males. The catch is, the more promiscuous the female is, the more likely her own genes are to survive in the long term. Female lions who are promiscuous have more surviving children than females who are not, simply because of the way their society is structured. In practice, only 60% of lion cubs born are fathered by that pride's alpha lion. For males, infanticide wins them a higher than 50% success rate and so qualifies as a winning strategy—but just barely. There is room for improvement and opportunity for reproductive success and exploitation by the right competing strategy.

Why am I using lions instead of chimps or gorillas for this model? Mostly because lions live in an open grass environment more similar to what proto-humans would have been living in while also displaying similar infanticide and counter-infanticide strategies to our primate cousins. Also, there is a lot of information available about lions and most people are familiar with lions, including the fact that adult males utilize infanticide as a reproductive strategy. As far as I know, humans are the only primates who forgo both trees and jungles, and an open grassland is somewhat important to my theory working. After all, if being pushed out of the trees and the jungle is what made humans human, then that environment is going to be pretty important to take into consideration when developing a theory of human evolutionary biology.

Now, back to my theory: Our beta male has just taken possession of some females (or one female) and she knows she's never had sex with this guy and is dreading what comes next—the death of her children. She's experienced this trauma and loss before and knows exactly what awaits her—watching her children die, then being forced into mating with and baring the children of this new guy. She has no real choice here. The males of her species are larger and stronger than the females, and even if she were to reject this new guy and attempt to strike out on her own, she can expect the same treatment from the very next male she comes across.

This new beta male is a beta because he does not have a strong infanticide instinct and instead of killing her children, chooses to protect and provide for those children as if they were his own. After having watched other males kill her earlier children, I can only imagine the loyalty this would inspire in the female (or females). This female chose to stick close to this male. She is being shown an entirely new type of relationship that she hadn't known could exist—one where all her children are valuable to her mate, not just the children fathered by him. One where she is respected and what is valuable to her is protected, not just a relationship where she is used as a means to his ends.

This isn't so far-fetched and does not lack precedent. Just like in human societies, there are leaders and people in charge whom are not particularly well-liked or popular, and then there are leaders and people in charge who are loved and cherished. In chimpanzees, the most successful alpha males are not necessarily those who are the biggest or strongest, but the ones who are the best politicians. The males who form the strongest coalitions and relationships with others, who are best at resolving disputes, and who are most able to remain impartial during fights (Frans de Waal). Well-liked alpha males are cared for and brought food when they are old and sick and will often appoint their own successor, while disliked alpha males are prone to be driven out at the first opportunity by another up-and-coming male and spend his last days alone and abandoned.

Back to the story: our beta male and ancestral female or females form a new family unit, get into a routine, and time passes. Then, as was inevitable, a new alpha male challenges our beta for his harem.

Any given alpha only has a certain amount of time with a harem before he is replaced with a new alpha, and this time crunch is a major driver for the male development of the infanticide reproductive strategy. It allows him to impregnate his females much more quickly, and possibly more times during his reign than he would be able to do otherwise. Any competing strategy is not only going to have to produce more healthy children that survive to adulthood than the infanticide strategy, but also be effective in the infanticide-dominated environment where the new strategy is competing. Our new beta is unlikely to have any more time with his harem than any other male, and his mutation of not being inclined to kill the rival children of his females has already put him at a severe reproductive disadvantage. Things are not looking so good for our beta.

When you get the chance, google a video of a lion taking over another lion's pride and watch how incredibly passive the females are.

They don't get involved. It's men's business, and the women stay out of it.

What happens if one or more of these females realizes that her life could be different? What happens after our ancestral female has been shown she could have a different sort of life, but that it can only be different with this one beta male? What happens when she knows her children are going to die if the new guy wins, but she knows that is doesn't have to be like that? When the old way of life that caused her so much trauma and so much pain isn't inevitable anymore? What happens when there is a different way?

What happens when the females join the fight?

Instead of 1-on-1, it's at least 2-on-1, and maybe more. Females can't fight as well as males, but they can be a hell of a distraction and a thorn in the new alpha's side. She can buy time, and she can do it at relatively low risk to herself. Ask any law enforcement officer who has ever dealt with a domestic dispute incident where the woman—who probably called the cops to begin with—suddenly turns on her rescuers when they arrest the man. The vast majority of law enforcement deaths and injuries are sustained at the hands of the male half of the couple, but the female half in the background is working hard at throwing rocks at the cop's heads and buying time for her mate to find an opening to exploit. Using FBI statistics, one study estimated that between 1980 and 2006 a total of 113,236 officer assaults occurred at DV calls in the U.S., and 160 officers died as a result of these assaults (Johnson, R.R).

I've been a Deputy Sheriff myself and worked with many more —the female half of domestic disturbance calls are almost always highly cooperative when law enforcement shows up, but the moment her man is threatened, that bitch will turn on you so fast you'll think it's Black Friday and you're holding the last Tickle Me Elmo©.

Were chimps or gorillas to utilize this model, it's likely it would not be successful simply because their environment is different. Females in open grasslands can chuck rocks and sneak in to deliver blows before retreating to a safe distance quickly, but when you are living in a jungle environment it's more difficult to utilize distance weapons and harder to retreat quickly. Trees and vines and leaves get in the way of throwing rocks, so you have to get closer. Trees and vines and scrub trip you up when retreating, so you are at higher risk of being injured with retaliation after landing a direct strike. The first thing police are trained to do when faced with a combat situation is to *create space*. Space gives you the opportunity to strategically retreat when needed. To dodge and block. Space also gives you the option of using distance weapons, such as wooden spears, which we know pre-

homo-sapiens were using by at least 400,000 years ago (Smithsonian).

Just try to use an expandable baton in a hallway—it's not going to happen. Chimp or gorilla females would put themselves at a higher risk of injury were they to assist their alpha males in a fight. Female lions, due to their lack of opposable thumbs, are also at a disadvantage because they cannot use distance weapons as a strategy. Our ancestral females, however, possessed the perfect storm in the open fields of her environment and her ability to use distance weapons, and so could assist her beta with a much lower risk to her own safety because she has the space to do so. This was an environment where a beta non-infanticide and male-female-cooperative reproductive strategy could thrive and out-compete the existing alpha-male-infanticide strategy.

Red Pill likes to go on about how women don't have an inbuilt protective instinct towards men like men have an inbuilt protective instinct towards women. When speaking about strangers, Red Pill is correct in this. However, human women are highly inclined to protect *their* men from danger in a way and to a degree that female lions, chimps, and gorillas simply are not.

It is important when playing this game of evolutionary biology and psychology to keep in mind that any mutations or strategies theorized not only have to give a net reproductive benefit, but must also be able to compete in the environment it evolves in. Super razor-sharp teeth that are highly efficient at piercing and tearing flesh are a fantastic and beneficial mutation… unless you're an herbivore.

A real-life example of this is lactose intolerance. The default state of mammals, including humans, is that we can only digest the sugar lactose in milk during our infancy and then we lose the ability after weaning. Humans have benefited from the milk produced from sheep, goats, cows, and horses for longer than anyone could drink the milk straight because our ancestors removed the milk sugars through fermentation and made cheese. Around 2,000-10,000 years ago, a single mutation sprang up in Europe which allowed one lucky human to digest milk all through adulthood. This allowed this person to utilize a dense calorie and nutrient source without the costly process of first turning it into cheese (Gerbault, Pascale). More food and better nutrition meant lower infant mortality and shorter spans between pregnancies. Children who inherited the mutation grew more quickly and survived to adulthood more often. It is estimated that this single mutation allowed up to a 19% increase in fertility compared to those who did not possess the mutation. Just like our blue-eyes example, the gene spread like wildfire. Today, roughly 100-500 generations later, 35% of the human population is able to digest milk through adulthood

(Curry, A).

The reason this mutation could not have evolved in Africa or the Americas is because sheep, goats, cows, and horses all hail from Eurasia. Even if the mutation had occurred on another continent, the environment in the Americas or Africa was not one that could allow the mutation to be a beneficial one.

Imagine being this ancestral female and believing for the whole of your life: "This is just reality. This is how it is. New males are going to kill my children. There is nothing I can do about it." Imagine being that female, having lived this reality and suffered the trauma of watching others kill her children, and then being shown a whole new possibility. She sees how her life could be different and better—a life where she isn't just a pawn or a tool in a male's reproductive strategy, or a life where only parts of her are valued by her mate, but a life where what is important and valuable to her is protected by him… just because it's important to her. This beta has offered her a type of relationship she had never fathomed before. Now, a new male is coming to take all that away from her. She knows that her better life is fully contingent on this one beta male surviving. Imagine, if for the first time in history that a woman's loyalty wasn't just to her children, but now also to her mate.

Our beta's got a hell of a better chance of winning this fight now, doesn't he? In fact, I bet our beta remains the head of his harem for a much, much longer time than a regular alpha would. Our beta manages to father way more children just because he has more time to do it versus the typical alpha males who get replaced more often. His beta genes get passed on and, just like with our blue eye mutation example, in time this pattern repeats and we get more and more males who don't kill rival's children and who earn the loyalty of their females, consistently. These betas may still only be fathering 60% of the children born to them due to female promiscuity, but the fact that he gets to hit that 60% for longer means more overall offspring fathered by our betas. By utilizing the female's fighting assistance during attempted harem takeovers, our beta has introduced a competing reproductive strategy that cannot only exist and survive in an infanticide-dominated environment, but thrives because of it.

In time, females see this beta dynamic more and more and even those without previous children to protect start selecting for it—maybe they defect into a beta's harem, maybe they assist betas in overthrowing their alphas, or maybe the betas that manage to score a harem just have an insanely high survival rate due to eager female protection. Over time, females see how stable a beta harem can be

when the females join in the fight, and maybe now they stop being so driven to mate with neighboring males since they don't fear infanticide so much. In fact, by leaving her beta's protection to be promiscuous, there is a slight risk of being forced into an alpha's harem. The evolutionary pressure to be promiscuous lessens, and new pressures to not be irrationally promiscuous come about. Females now use promiscuity much more strategically and only when they sense instability in their relationships or in the health or capabilities of their betas, instead of as standard operating procedure. Now, not only are betas getting more time to father more children, but also more fidelity because the females realize they don't always have to trade sex for the lives of their children. The typical 60% paternity certainty goes up. Beta genes snowball in the population. These traits compound over time and many generations. Females and betas become more and more interdependent and, with him having her back and him knowing she's got his back, loyalty starts to go both ways and turns into what will become modern pair-bonding.

More time passes. Our species continues to evolve bigger brains which means weaker and younger babies, so now betas can support fewer and fewer females. Beta harems turn into (mostly) monogamy with the increased demands of increasingly helpless and demanding children. Sometimes a beta isn't able to provide enough (it's a big job and I won't pretend that it's not), so the female will occasionally sneak off and trade sex for a meal or other necessity with a nearby male. She's once again strategically trading sex for her and her children's survival, but for different reasons.

Since women and children always have to eat even when mom's not fertile, women who were able to be sexually receptive outside of their ovulation cycles developed better reproductive fitness over those who did not. This adaptation was useful not only to ease tensions and solidify bonds, but could also be used as currency for resources. Some males inevitably took advantage of this sexual niche and specialize in always having meals and other necessities available for willing females by not taking on their own females full-time. These males are the new alphas.

These new alphas are actually betas in that they are not driven to commit infanticide (the insane success rate of earlier betas drove those genes out of the species), but they do exploit a sexual niche by utilizing a different mating strategy to appeal to women's hypergamy —a hypergamy based on what I like to call beta-need beta-need. This hypergamy is still dualistic, or even more-istic, but unlike alpha-seed beta-need these new alphas are simply exploiting an opportunity for short-term, non-pair-bonding and transactional sexual liaisons and are

not inherently superior, genetically speaking.

These new alphas also can't outcompete the more successful betas because the environment where this alpha strategy evolved was one where human children required more than one adult provider to survive to adulthood. So while the alpha niche exists, the strategy could not win out over the beta strategy. Since the new alpha strategy could only exploit an occasional sexual niche and was not successful enough to out-produce the beta strategy, alpha and beta strategies established a balance. Since women reproduced with both types and the factions never diverged, an extreme of one-or-the-other strategies in human males could not evolve. The potential for both strategies exist simultaneously in modern human males, manifesting much as obesity does—because of environmental opportunity and slight genetic predispositions towards one or the other.

In my theory, the female strategies of the old alpha harem infanticide model are adapted to a primarily monogamous beta model, but the old strategies never go away entirely. Because of the incredible challenge of provisioning for children who require years of intense parenting, human females retained a few old tricks. By that same token, there is nothing to say that a particularly successful beta would have any conflict with provisioning several females, which would explain why polygamy has persisted in our species across cultures. That would be how our first beta started out, after all. Monogamy only became a thing because one is the average number of women whose children an average male could successfully provide for.

If, in your theory, women evolved to only have sex with alphas in exchange for provisioning, then isn't it evidence against your theory for today's women to still seek sex with alphas, since all their basic needs are already met?

That would be evidence against my theory if we evolved in modern times with modern dynamics, but we didn't evolve in modern times, just like we didn't evolve in an environment where there was plenty of food. We have lots of food now, and yet we still crave food to the point where we are eating ourselves into bad health. This is a very new challenge for our species: we have become so successful in the modern Western civilization that we have *too much* food. Not simply enough food with some extra, but literally too much food and it's a very real problem.

Why don't we just stop eating so much once we reach an optimum weight? Why are we so biologically driven to eat and eat and eat our way into obesity and diabetes? Well, because there was

never an evolutionary reason for us to put a limit on our food consumption. It simply never came up, and so our ancestors never had to have a "cap" put on how much food they craved. We live in an alien environment where there isn't simply enough food to keep us alive and healthy, but so much food that it drives us to be unhealthy.

Let us again consider the environment our ancestral mothers would have found themselves in. Once monogamy became the primary mating strategy, the benefits of having many monogamous couples living in communities and cooperating with each other would outweigh the earlier beta males' need to keep competing males away, lest he risk losing his hard-won females. Since the vast majority of men could only support one woman and her children, the risk of losing his mate became less than the benefit he would gain from mutual cooperation. The environment is always changing, and each new change creates trickle-down changes, which can often come full circle and affect the original change yet again.

Multi-male communities where those males cooperate with each other as equals is yet another problem that Red Pill's alpha-seed beta-need theory fails to explain. How could a stable community of many males and many females develop when all the males are ultimately competing with each other over all the females? Gorillas, chimps, and lions all live in multi-adult male communities (or live in them often enough), but they all develop a male hierarchy with a clear alpha male. Silverback gorillas who don't find approval with an alpha are rejected from the community and live as roaming loners. Male chimpanzees and lions form bachelor prides which lack any females. Mixed-gender groups where males can interact and cooperate as equals simply do not exist in species where it is common for males to have many simultaneous female mates, yet it is the norm in human societies across history. It is only when it is highly unlikely that a nearby male would be able to steal another male's female that it becomes possible for that level of cooperation amongst males to occur.

In other words, if alpha-seed beta-need is the correct model, then any beta dumb enough to allow other males into his territory would quickly be out bred, as his female would cuck him in favor of even a marginally more impressive male. When I say that competition amongst males is fierce, what I'm saying is that only 1 in 8 male lions survive to adulthood to even compete for females in the first place (Main). However, if beta-need beta-need is closer to the correct model, then monogamy is the norm and learning to cooperate with other males so that everyone's women and children have more provisioning actually *decreases* the rate of those same males being cucked. It will still happen, but once females learned that the risk of sleeping around

was only worth taking if she were in need of extra provisioning, then the strategy changes. Beta males created a new reproductive pressure for themselves: those that learned reciprocal reciprocity and cooperation were cucked less often than betas who kept their distance from other males, and that cooperative strategy and the genes that influenced it outperformed the competing alleles.

So, our beta males still practiced mate-guarding, but to a lesser extent and made allowances for reciprocal relationships with other males based on mutual need and assistance. Just like how female lions learned to cooperate with other female lions, so too did early human males, once competition between males reduced and monogamy became the norm.

Unfortunately, the biological mechanisms that evolved to make sure needs get met don't turn off once those needs get met. Despite how long our ancestors have been producing a surplus of food, that evolved core mechanism to gorge ourselves on rich food when we get the chance hasn't abated one bit. No matter how happy, healthy, well-fed, surrounded with material wealth and blissed out with orgasms we get, humans will never be content and will want more.

That is the nature of our biology—both for men, women, and every single other biological critter out there. Just like the basic drive to seek out more food doesn't go away once we have enough food, the basic drive to occasionally seek out alphas with extra resources doesn't go away just because our basic needs have been met. So, women may still be going through the motions of having sex with alphas even though the underlying reasoning isn't there anymore, just like people will go through the motions of eating an entire bag of Reeses™ even though they need to lose 20lbs.

Many state that I haven't really come up with a new theory compared to Red Pill, but I disagree. The logical ramifications of beta-need beta-need are worlds different from alpha-seed beta-need, and I will go into more of the economics of modern day beta-need beta-need ramifications later, but this is the alternative foundation I am offering to counter Red Pill's alpha-seed beta-need hypothesis. It's a theory, and not something I am holding up as absolute truth. I welcome challenges to this theory. I want more people to think up their own theories that fill the holes and cover the logical fallacies of alpha-seed beta-need. I want a conversation. So many of the problems the Red Pill community has stems from this basic theory presented as fact, repeated again and again ad nauseam. Red Pill doesn't offer truths, it offers lies. They may be honest lies—lies born from ignorance of how to Science and ignorance of the dangers of inductive reasoning, but lies nonetheless. Repeating a lie again and again doesn't make it true

—it only makes it believed.

The Feminine Primary Order

Do not try and bend the spoon—that's impossible. Instead, only try to realize the truth.

- Young Monk

What truth?

- Neo

There is no spoon.

- Young Monk, *The Matrix* (1999)

Red Pill has many names for what it likes to call the "feminine primary order," including a "gynocentric society" and the "feminine imperative." According to Red Pill, the feminine primary order is a means of control that feminists exert upon men by insisting on equality between men and women. To solidify the feminine order's power, men must be made to be confused as to the nature of their masculinity and must be convinced to yield to the whims of women in a gynocentric society. This is achieved through both redistributing wealth and assets via a gender-biased legal system from men to women, and through the social redefinition of what a 'real man' can and will do in regards to serving women. To put it another way, any aspect of 'manliness' the feminine imperative finds useful is kept, such as protecting women or earning a high wage, while any aspect of "maleness" the feminine imperative finds threatening will be defined as toxic masculinity, patriarchal, or misogynistic, such as being sexually promiscuous or emotionally stoic.

In addition to numerous social expectations, Red Pill asserts the West is now a gynocentric society as evidenced by unfair marriage and divorce laws, by economic wages, and by the high levels of support for women's causes such as breast cancer and women's shelters while completely dismissing the equivalent male problems of prostate cancer and men's shelters. Red Pill claims men are being subjugated by feminism through these means. The existence of a feminine primary order is critical to Red Pill teachings and comes up in almost any conversation or written piece when discussing it. According to Red Pill, it is only though feminism and the feminine imperative that women can prioritize their own innate and unchecked solipsism and hypergamy and gain their destructive independence over patriarchy and the cartel of the feminine, which allegedly once kept women's mating strategy more in balance with men's.

As far as the disparity of men's shelters compared to women's,

I am completely on board with Red Pill's claims and believe this is an area our society needs to improve upon, and quickly. My time spent as a Deputy Sheriff showed me just how frequently the husbands were the victim in domestic abuse cases, how few resources were available to them compared to women, and just how little anyone seemed to give a damn about these men. According to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, 1 in 4 women and 1 in 9 men will be victims of severe physical violence by their intimate partner in their lifetime (NCADV). Just because it happens more often to women does not negate the fact that it also happens to men, and the men it happens to have far fewer resources available to assist them. The sheer lack of resources available to these men compared to women and the sheer weight of the presumed blame is an appalling reality our society needs to address sooner rather than later.

In regards to the disparity between breast cancer research and prostate cancer research, it is true that prostate cancer claims more lives than breast cancer, but economically and socially speaking, breast cancer is still more destructive. I'll explain: up until about 1990, breast cancer claimed more lives than prostate cancer, but since then prostate cancer has far outpaced breast cancer in number of lives lost. However, breast cancer claims women who are significantly younger than the men that prostate cancer claims. When calculating years of life lost (or comparing the age at which a person dies of a disease versus the age they would be expected to die without the disease), breast cancer is still three times more destructive than prostate cancer. The average age of a man who dies from prostate cancer is 80 while the average age a woman dies of breast cancer is 68, both with a non-disease life expectancy of roughly 80. So while the statistics look skewed in arbitrary favor of women's health issues, there is a reasonable social and economic argument for having greater resources funneled into breast cancer versus prostate cancer (The Economist, 2018).

Feminism has destroyed the nuclear family by making it impossible for a man to provide for a family on one income.

This is another consistent claim from Red Pill that confuses me as to its persistence. Red Pill claims that feminism, by allowing women to enter the workplace and compete with men, has consequently doubled the availability of labor and thus halved the cost of labor, which means that today two incomes are required to meet the needs of a family where one income was sufficient back in the 'good old days' to meet the needs of a family. Red Pill sees this two-income requirement and economic dependence upon women as directly responsible for the moral decline of our society. Since

children are necessarily being raised by daycares rather than stay-at-home-mothers, this has, supposedly, lead to such perpetual sins as fatherlessness and promiscuity.

Firstly, while the initial suggestion that doubling the labor force halves the cost of labor, this isn't truly the case in a capitalist system. Labor, income, and supply and demand are not zero-sum games. A study published in The American Economic Review looked closely at the economic impacts of state-level gains in women's rights between 1860 and 1920. It found in nearly all cases that areas with more economic rights and opportunities for women correlated with higher per capita wealth *for everyone* than areas with less economic rights and opportunities for women, and the economies in states with more freedoms for women grew faster than the economies of states that did not. (Geddes, Lueck).

Historically, the wealthiest and most powerful cultures were the ones that recognized the individual and economic rights of their women. The incredible wealth and influence of Ancient Egypt needs no introduction. While ancient Egyptian women from the roughly 2000 B.C. era were expected socially to submit to their men, husbands could not control their wife's property. Women could own and manage businesses and were legally the equal of men in court—which means they could sue, be sued, and enter into contracts independent of any male handler. Divorce was a fairly simple matter and any property brought into the marriage by the woman stayed with the woman and any property accumulated during the marriage was considered jointly owned and split accordingly. Custody of children went by default to the mother. Only an evidentially supported charge of infidelity could deny a woman her rights in a divorce (Wojciechowska, Agnieszka).

Freeborn women in ancient Rome could not hold political office, but only women could hold a specific priestly office of the Vestals who devoted themselves to decades of study and education and whose duties were considered essential for the security and safety of Rome (Britannica). Women were generally married young and the legal system favored the father being able to pressure his daughter into marriages that benefited his social status. However, young women could legitimately refuse a match by showing the proposed groom was of poor character. Socially and legally, daughters were expected to defer to their fathers even after they married and her husband had no legal authority over her or her property. In practice, very few legal restrictions were put on a woman's day-to-day life after her marriage. Unless she was specifically excluded from the will, a daughter inherited equally from her father's estate as her brothers

(Cartwright, Mark). As early as the 5th century B.C., women could write their own wills, own land, and appear in court to conduct cases either on their own behalf or on the behalf of others. Divorce was a fairly simple matter of a woman moving out of her husband's home and taking back her dowry, and did not seem to have brought much social shame or consequence, although any children produced during the marriage were considered the property of the man (Wikipedia).

China's Song Dynasty lasted from the 10th-13th centuries and Fortune estimates it produced roughly 22.7% of the world's economic output during that time (Maddison, Angus p.261). The Song Dynasty made significant contributions to the realms of science, art, engineering, war, forensic science, printing, sailing, and was the society responsible for commercializing agriculture. The period of the Song Dynasty is generally considered to be a period of declining status for women compared to earlier dynasties, mostly due to their political and social roles becoming more restrained along with the very physical restraint of the practice of foot-binding becoming fashionable. However, women's property rights and economic freedoms were expanded and reinforced during this time. For the first time in China, a woman could inherit from her parent's estate and even take her brothers to court to fight for familial property. Her property and dowry were protected from her husband's influence and reverted to her upon divorce or widowhood, rather than to her father. Women could own and manage businesses, gain high levels of education, and widows had a high level of independent latitude in naming an heir (Bernhardt, Kathyrn). In order to get around some laws requiring brothers to share property, many husbands took to the practice of purchasing lands and property in their wife's name, thus leaving her quite wealthy upon his death or upon divorce, which women could and did initiate if she became dissatisfied with her husband (Gou, Wu).

India's Mughal Dynasty lasted from 1526 to 1858. They invested heavily in roads, ports, river routes, and other infrastructure to make themselves a key crossroads in global trade, and by around 1700, were ruling the wealthiest empire and commanded the largest military in the world. There were strict gender norms that subjugated women during this time, but economically, women had many options. Women inherited property from her deceased parents (both mother and father), and from her deceased husband and could appear in court to enforce their rights to this property. Women had control over their own property independent of a male handler and could mortgage or sell her property at will. Common stipulations within middle-class marriage contracts forbade husbands from taking additional wives, from beating his wife, and from economically abandoning his wife.

Violations of these contract clauses were sufficient cause for a woman to divorce her husband. Additional common clauses prevented the husband from obtaining concubines and violation of this clause gave the wife the right to sell the concubine and keep the money for herself. Women could own shops, sell wares, enter into legal transactions, and work for wages in jobs such as midwifery, nursing, performer, and scholar (Yasmin).

In fact, I cannot find a single historical example of a culture that improved the economic rights of women and suffered a decrease in economic prosperity. While correlation does not necessarily mean causation, it's a heck of a difficult correlation to dismiss outright.

This does bring us back to the original question of "why can't one income support a family like it did in the past?" Well… one income can, and does. According to US Census data, between 20 and 33% of couples with children are single-income, with the highest percentage being represented by families with the youngest children and the lowest percentage represented by families with older (school-age) children (BLS).

My family falls into this demographic with me being a stay-at-home mom. My husband and I made sacrifices early in our marriage to eliminate credit card and student loan debt accrued during college, have made wise and prudent financial decisions since, and today my husband's salary as a public school teacher pays for all our family of four's needs, including a 3 bedroom, 2 bath home on some acreage and two working, fully paid off vehicles. My side-gig contributions, including money earned through writing, are extra. Some years, my financial contributions are very extra and we are able to make investments into our homestead, afford significant home improvements, or reinvest into my side gigs in hopes of future payoffs. We've even used my extras to pay down our existing mortgage, thus reducing that particular financial burden by several years. However, we have budgeted so that only his income is necessary to run our home, and there have been years where my health was poor enough that I was unable to contribute anything to the household coffers. In those years, we barely qualify as middle class and are well below the average for household incomes of single-income two-parent households. In years where I am able to contribute some extra, we're pretty close to the average, so it's not unreasonable to say I've got some first-hand insights into the types of families that pull this off.

How do we afford this on a public school teacher's salary? Well, elimination of debt is a big part of it, and we both sacrificed for many years in the early part of our marriage to make that happen by living well below our means and forgoing many luxuries our

coworkers easily afforded. By eliminating the colossal burden of debt most couples maintain, we are now able to live more comfortably than most of my husband's colleagues whose wives also bring in a steady income. We also take care to make informed financial choices—for instance, in one year when I was able to contribute a significant amount of money to the budget, we decided to expand our homestead with a herd of milking goats to provide the family with fresh, high-quality milk, butter, and cheese. I took special care to select a breed of goat that would not only meet our family's needs, but which were also in high demand. This meant the initial cost for the goats was higher, but in time, by selling the extra babies, the herd would earn enough money to pay for its own hay and grain instead of being a continual financial liability. While the initial cost of building barns and fences was high, these were one-time capital costs and we had the cash in hand. Had I purchased unregistered goats or chosen a breed in less demand, ultimately they would cost the same to feed and maintain, but would bring me less money with the eventual sale of their kids. So, after the initial costs were paid, the herd gives us the fresh milk we want and pays its own way financially.

These are the kinds of careful financial decisions my husband and I have made, time and time again, throughout our 14-year marriage. If we have the cash in hand, then we will rarely shirk at a larger capital cost, but are always wary of any ongoing financial obligations. I do not have a smartphone and instead keep a cheap, dinosaur-era flip phone that can only text by hitting a number three times to get a single letter. I'm at home most of the time and have access to a desktop computer, so there really isn't any need for me to have a smartphone and incur the extra $40/month for a shared data plan, not to mention the extra cost of the phone itself. We have one TV in the house and only pay for Netflix. While I am an avid reader, I'll buy a new book maybe once per year and the rest of the time I utilize my local library and used book sales. Meals are planned around what's growing in the garden and shopped for and prepped accordingly to reduce waste. Clothing and shoes are purchased used and I take care to select high-quality and well-made pieces which will last, particularly when shopping for children's items that could be passed down.

In other words, it is perfectly possible in today's economy for one income to support a family and it statistically occurs quite frequently in households with two adults and children. All that must happen for this 1950s-era Red-Pill idealist phenomena to occur is for both adult parties to utilize 1950s-era budgeting and frugality choices. Most 1950s housewives maintained a garden and cooked the majority of the family's meals from scratch, as I do. Most 1950s housewives

knew how to sew and maintain high-quality clothing, as I do, although I can honestly purchase gently used pieces more cheaply than I can make them from new fabric, and then simply alter or repair as needed. Most 1950s husbands maintained a steady job that provided benefits, as my husband does. Most 1950s husbands had basic handiness skills and handled minor, moderate, and sometimes extensive home repairs themselves, as my husband does. No one in the 1950s paid for Wi-Fi or streaming services, and yet we still manage to afford these modern luxuries.

At this point, I tend to get called out for being condescending in an economic reality where few believe they can achieve economic stability with children and only one income. If the data told me that, say, 5% or less of married couples with children survived on one income, then I'd absolutely see an argument for that. If it is something many people want (and many Red Pill men seem to want this), but only few achieve, then I'd be forced to acknowledge that my situation is unique and a result of the stars aligning. However, the data tells me that one in five USA parents is a stay-at-home caretaker (Terrazas, Aaron). Approximately 27% of mothers and 7% of fathers, to be exact, giving a picture of roughly a third of households who survive on one income (Livingston, Gretchen 2018). One-third is a variation of normal, not an extreme minority. Because of this, I have difficulty justifying my treating a one-income household as anything other than normal. I could probably write a whole other book on this subject, but ultimately the economics of a one-income household is based on reducing financial liability, while the economics of a two-income household is based on increasing financial contribution.

I'll offer an example: The average monthly grocery bill for a family of four with two incomes is $1,240 (USDA). My family of four's monthly grocery bill is $550—$400 of which is spent at the grocery store, and $150 or so that is spent on larger bulk food purchases. When you don't have time, you pay for convenience and must earn more (increased financial contribution). The labor of a stay-at-home partner removes the need to pay for convenience (reduces financial liability). It can be difficult to conceptualize the latter when you are only familiar with the former, but this is the way things work. There is nothing about the modern economy with its modern women's economic opportunities that excludes the possibility of a single income supporting a household.

What is an odd expectation, however, is that one income *should* be enough to support a family. This is actually a very new and modern economic expectation.

Dowries have a history going back over three thousand years

and can be found in cultures and religions around the planet. Our modern economy has done away with dowries not because they were sexist and feminists hated them, but because the function of a dowry is now filled by a woman's economic freedom to earn a wage. Throughout history, women have always been expected to contribute half of a couple's economic earnings; it's only that before modern times this was achieved through a woman's dowry instead of through her labor.

A dowry was an amount of money and/or property bequeathed upon a woman at the time of her marriage, usually by her parents. This could be anything from cold-hard cash to land to livestock, or all of the above, and it was meant to provide for her household and children during her marriage and to provide a means for her to support herself if she remained unmarried or became widowed. In the West, the beginnings of women's economic freedom began with the legal protection from mismanagement and extortion of a woman's dowry by her husband (Buckstaff, Florence). In other words, the legal recognition as women having rights to her own property instead of being property that came with other property. This change was not caused by early feminist protesting in the streets, but pushed by wealthier men who stood to gain from the increased economic output of their wives when women were allowed to earn income (Geddes & Lueck).

Dowries play key plot roles in Shakespeare's plays as well as Jane Austin's novels and were simply a fact of household economic life. Modern readers tend to gloss over these economic realities simply because we don't understand them very well. In Regency era marriages, the woman's dowry was generally in cash and was to be invested at four or five percent with the interest being part of the couple's yearly income—specifically, half of the married couple's income. *Pride and Prejudice* shows a mother obsessed with finding "good matches" for her daughters because, as it is explicitly stated many times in the novel, their dowries are insufficient to permit men of their same social class to marry them. In other words, only a very rich man could afford to marry one of the Bennett daughters and still maintain an upper-class lifestyle. Mrs. Bennett knew very well that without securing some very wealthy husbands, her daughters would likely end up as spinsters and their meager dowries would only produce the equivalent wage of a lower-class coal miner. In other words, upon the death of Mr. Bennett, the daughters would be destitute with no way to improve their economic lot in life. By securing even one wealthy husband, however, Mrs. Bennett could finagle a way for that married daughter to support her less fortunate sisters.

Men were expected to contribute the other half of the family's income—either through inheritance if he were the eldest son, or through a working wage if he were a younger brother. Middle-class younger sons could become merchants, bankers, and solicitors, while upper-class younger sons could become lawyers, join the military, or enter the clergy. Since men were recognized as fully sovereign and independent legal entities, there is no male historical equivalent of a dowry that is different from what is expected from men today, because men have always had the legal and social ability to economically provide for themselves.

The only modern difference seems to be that Red Pill believes modern men should have the entirety of the household economic burden placed on their shoulders, when it's only the last 100-120 years or so when that has even been within the realm of economic possibility.

To put into perspective just how much and how quickly our species has moved forward both technologically and economically in recent times, consider this: chariots were invented around 2000 B.C. and were the fastest mode of transportation until trains in the 1800s. That's 3,800 years of unchanging transportation technology. Then, in 1903, the Wright brothers built a machine that allowed them to fly—a mere 103 years later. On July 20th, 1969, or just 66 years after that, man left earth in rocket ships and set foot on the moon.

The past century in the West, even including the Great Depression, has seen the greatest explosion of economic growth and prosperity in our species' history and that is probably the sole reason why it's been possible during that (and this) time for a single, modest income to support an entire family's needs. Unlike earlier in our Western history, today both men and women are capable of *increasing* wealth in a marriage, whereas before women contributed, but only men could increase the wealth in a marriage. Not only does Red Pill not know how to Science, it apparently also does not know how to History.

Women initiate 70% of all divorces. This is because the feminine primary order makes it profitable for women to divorce.

Yes, women do initiate most divorces. While breakups out of marriage seem to be about 50/50, there is a significant difference in which gender initiates the break-up after marriage. The research I've found does indicate that breakups outside of marriage are initiated equally between the genders and I've yet to see any Red Pill advocates saying it's anything other than 50/50, so I'm going to use this as a starting point where both Red Pill and I agree (Rosenfeld, Michael).

Most statistics I've seen on this are from 2015 and show that women initiate divorce 69% of the time. Later statistics from 2020, while not from as reliable sources, show numbers closer to 80%. For the sake of argument, I'm going to be working with the latter numbers.

This is an interesting phenomenon, and I have spent a good amount of time looking into it. We either have a situation where the incentives or disincentives to seek divorce are roughly equal and for some reason women are disproportionately dissatisfied with their marriages, or we have a situation where both parties are roughly equally dissatisfied with their marriage but women have either more incentive or less disincentive than men to seek divorce, or some combination of the two. In complex systems, it's almost always the third option, and Red Pill seems to agree with me. Red Pill's most common theories to explain this discrepancy is that (1) modern laws economically incentivize women to divorce their husbands through overly punitive alimony and child support burdens placed on the man, and (2) men's inherent idealism makes them less likely to want to divorce their wives and instead makes them more willing to stay and try to make a less than ideal situation work, while women's inherent solipsism and hypergamy pushes her to reject a less-than-perfect man when she perceives she has better mate options.

I've looked at many opinions and theories to explain this divorce discrepancy and, frankly, most fail to convince me. The most common reasons given are inequitable shares of the housework, with women not only holding down paying day jobs, but also being expected to work the bulk of the evening shift of housework and childcare. This does seem to have validity and is likely a contributing factor, as non-married cohabiting men contribute more to housework than married men. Marriages where the women felt they were doing more than their fair share of the housework are more likely than not to lead to divorce (Frisco, Williams). However, I'm more inclined to see this as a symptom of an already unhealthy relationship rather than a standalone problem that degrades a relationship all by itself.

Much as I see a significant reduction in sex as a symptom rather than a cause of a relationship heading for breakup, a man who is expecting more housework from his wife than he is willing to do is either actively disrespecting his wife and is ambivalent to her needs, or believes he is giving so much in the relationship in other ways that he deserves to and is entitled to slack off in the housework.

A man who is sexually satisfied feels wanted and respected by his wife and feels appreciated rather than taken advantage of, and feels his needs are being met within the relationship, while a wife who

sees her husband doing what she perceives as his fair share of the housework feels respected and appreciated and feels she is being treated as a partner rather than a subordinate, and feels her needs are being met within the relationship. A woman withholding sex from her husband, baring medical issues, either does not respect him and thus cannot muster up any level of attraction or physical appreciation for him, or is narcissistic and is consciously playing power games within her relationship. None of these scenarios has any place within a healthy and functioning relationship, but the point is that the symptoms are not the problem. Fix the symptoms with the husband mechanically doing more chores and the wife mechanically offering more sex, and the underlying problems will still be there.

The data backs me up on this—the most stable and happiest marriages are the ones where husbands participate in housework, yet the actual amount of housework he does does not result in greater sexual frequency (Kornrich, Brines, Leupp; Cooke). This indicates, to me (a housewife), that women are not necessarily asking for true gender egalitarianism when it comes to the minutia of domestic life—not even when she is working equal hours outside the home. I'd theorize that it only comes up when the women feel unappreciated for the work they are putting into making the domestic life happen. When their work is not valued, and so by extension their role in the relationship is not valued, they make an issue of it. When the husband shows through his actions that he does not consider "her" work beneath him, she feels validated and appreciated for the paycheck-free and unquantifiable work she performs. I've long observed that it doesn't seem to matter to men *how* hard or long they have to work, so long as they are genuinely valued, respected, recognized, and appreciated for their labors. I don't see evidence to indicate that women are any different, and my personal experience tells me the same. Some of this men-not-doing-housework is self-inflicted by women who teach their sons and husbands incompetence. These women push their sons and husbands away from the work and berate them for doing it incorrectly, rather than offering guidance and positive reinforcement. This causes the men to feel they can't do anything good enough, and then to default into doing nothing. But then again, it's still not the housework itself that is the problem—there is underlying communication and respect issues at play in the relationship.

Of the theories I've seen, Red Pill's is, on the surface, the most convincing of the lot. However, the second assumption of men's idealism vs. women's solipsism is not supported by the data or we would see a discrepancy in gendered break-up initiations outside of marriage. If men are inherently idealistic and women inherently

solipsistic and hypergamous, then even without any presumed economic incentives we'd still see women breaking up with men more often than men breaking up with women outside of marriage, since the very requirement of a break-up assumes some level of commitment already made within the relationship. If women truly were more solipsistic, and if men truly were more idealistic in the way they love within relationships, then we would see a pattern of men being less inclined to disband romantic relationships. Instead, we get a 50/50 split (Rosenfeld).

This leaves the idea of there being economic incentives for women to initiate divorce. Historically, this is a bit of a quandary. While alimony has been around since B.C. days, child support in the USA wasn't a thing until 1950, and women in the 1940s still initiated divorce two-thirds of the time (Rosenfeld). This was from Red Pill's "good old days" when men were men and women were women and fathers were present and women were expected to not work outside the home and all that, and yet we still have a significant gap in gendered divorce initiations despite a complete lack of no-fault divorces and the requirement that the party seeking divorce prove infidelity or abandonment. Frankly, this alone calls the assumption of economic incentives for women into serious question. I will leave this topic here for now—I have my own theory, which I will explain later in this chapter.

Divorce rape is how women use the Feminine Primary Order to screw over men.

Divorce rape is a heinous, devastating, and traumatizing life event. I will not attempt to minimize this fact. Urban Dictionary describes divorce rape as a scenario where a woman uses the bias of the court system to take an unfair portion of the husband's assets or to deny him access to his children. In simple terms, just like in the crime of sexual rape where an act meant to solidify bonds and share pleasure is turned into a weapon, so too divorce rape is when the legal system, meant to solidify contracts and resolve disputes equitably, is turned into a weapon.

Red Pill has expanded the definition of divorce rape to include almost any case where the man is ordered to pay alimony, child support, or ends up with less than 50% custody of his children, as divorce rape. Frankly, this is akin to extremist feminists expanding the definition of sexual rape to include morning-after-regret cases, where the man was somehow supposed to understand that his fully consenting partner wasn't as willing as she was portraying herself to be (Schwyzer, Hugo).

Culturally speaking, women working outside the home is optional, not expected, while men are expected to work and provide for the family. This isn't the most politically correct claim, but it is our current reality. Red Pill doesn't seem to have a problem with this idea and generally holds up the more traditional model of family gender dynamics as the ideal, with mom staying home to take care of the kids and dad earning the money through outside employment.

I'm of the opinion that this is ultimately the most practical and beneficial model to raise children in, presuming both parties are in agreement and willing. After all, *someone* has to raise the children. Dad is certainly capable, but if the well-known health benefits of breastfeeding are to be had, then the stay-at-home parent has to be Mom, at least for the first year. Once that year is up it generally makes more sense for Mom to stay at home rather than Dad as her earning potential has inevitably taken a hit from her break in the workforce and, having spent more time with the child, she is going to be more in tune with the minutia of her child's routine and needs. If both parents work, then someone *still* has to raise the children, and that daily duty inevitably falls to whatever child care provider the parents have secured, be it Grandma or community daycare. Grandma certainly has a reason to invest heavily into her grandchild, but that arrangement is the minority and most daycare providers are there for a paycheck with no vested interest in going above and beyond for the child's sake, putting the two-earner family's child at a potential disadvantage. I'm not saying that daycare is evil or damaging, only that it is less than ideal compared to being cared for full-time by an invested parent who wants to be there.

This brings us to the reality that if a wife chooses to serve her family and her husband by staying home to raise the children and care for the home, she is inevitably sacrificing her own ability to maintain or build a career in order to do so. If she were not at home doing very important unpaid work, she'd be gainfully employed with paid work. As a stay-at-home-mom, I can attest that both my husband and I work very hard at our respective jobs. Mine just doesn't give me a W-2 at the end of the year and his does. My work is a lot harder to quantify because it does not result in a dollar amount earned or in any measurable criteria that can be grafted into a quarterly report's visual aid. But, it's also hard to argue that my children are no better off for having their mother at home, teaching both manors and arithmetic, mediating arguments, limiting screen time and electronics in favor of imagination-based toys and books, answering endless questions, cooking healthy meals from scratch, and providing hugs on demand, versus being thrown in a room with twenty other kids and having the TV turned on to keep them entertained and quiet (Park, Madison). Not

everyone will agree with me on this, and that's fine. Preferring to have a full-time parent at home to raise the children is a personal value, and not everyone holds it. Some have a personal value that children should have as much socialization as possible, and would likely see my style of parenting as borderline neglectful. I really don't think there is a right or wrong answer here. I happen to hold stay-at-home parenting as a personal value, my husband happens to hold it, and a large percentage of Red Pill men seem to hold it.

I will add a disclaimer here that this is work that must be chosen to be beneficial. Resentment is a poison that builds and seeps into the cracks of everyday relationships, burning and destroying as it goes. Women who want to work outside the home, either full-time or part-time, should have that choice available to them. For many women, working outside the home is an economic requirement rather than a choice, but that is not true for every woman. By that same token, a man who does not want the burden of being the sole breadwinner of his family shouldn't have his financial security jeopardized for the sake of his partner exercising an optional choice. Any scenario where the couple is working as a partnership and in agreement as to how to utilize their labor is a healthy dynamic. So while I don't believe that a mother *should* be a housewife and primary caretaker, ultimately Red Pill and I are in agreement over it being a good setup.

Women who choose to stay at home to raise children (and as we've already seen, a significant percentage of married women with children do), are working with their husbands as part of a partnership —the wife's primary work is geared towards investing time and energy into the children and home, while the husband's primary work is geared towards providing the family with financial stability. To accomplish this, the wife sacrifices her ability to maintain and/or build financial stability for herself. This benefits not just her, but also her children and her husband. My husband certainly enjoys spending his free time with calmer, well-behaved children and eating regular home-cooked meals. Just because Dad is the one earning the money doesn't mean both are not working towards shared goals.

Red Pill advocates often try to frame these partnerships in terms of business, or employer/employee relationships, with the man being the leader, provider, and boss of the relationship. A 'captain and first mate' analogy is also commonly drawn, but in essence the idea is that while the employee or first mate can discuss issues with the boss or captain, ultimately it is the man whose orders are always final and it is the woman's role to obey and support those decisions. However, even in highly traditional and conservative relationships where the

man is recognized as the head of the household and leader of the family, the dynamic that results is not one that resembles an employer and employee (baring, of course, the most extreme religious factions). A partnership is about healthy codependence—it is about forming bonds that grow to become more than the sum of its parts. Red Pill sees the success of these relationships as contingent upon a given framework, and one which must never usurp the man's primacy and will.

While it's clear that the stay-at-home wife is economically dependent upon her husband, what's less immediately clear is that the husband is also dependent upon his wife to give the sort of upbringing he wishes to provide for his children—an environment and upbringing that he cannot provide without her. It truly is a team effort of two partners mutually investing in their shared goals via different forms of work. You can argue that the quantifiable work is more valuable than the unquantifiable work, but that is ultimately a personal opinion, and presumably the theoretical married couple in this model both valued the wife's unquantifiable work enough for the husband to agree to financially support the entire family on his own.

Thus, in the case of divorce, there is no moral argument against a wife accepting half all the partnership's resources, including income. Without this established precedent, men would have an incentive to exploit and mistreat their wives and women would have no resources and extremely limited means to provide for themselves and their children after divorce. Women would have a huge disincentive to sacrifice their own financial security by staying at home and investing in home and children, which would prevent both husbands and wives from providing the kind of environment and upbringing they (presumably) wish for their family. Even when the mother continues to work outside the home, it is almost always the mother who takes on the primary responsibility of the children at the expense of her work—she is the one who more often takes days off when the kids are sick or when they need to be taken to appointments, she is the one who more often leaves work early to attend school functions or meetings, and she is the one who more often fields questions and phone calls from sitters and daycare during work hours. All of these things chip away at a mother's ability to grow her earning potential over time versus women who are not mothers. And, more specifically, all these things feed into a workplace "motherhood penalty" where employers view mothers as being less committed to their jobs and less competent in their jobs because of their presumed prioritization of their motherhood duties versus non-mothers. On the flip side to this, fathers typically enjoy a workplace "fatherhood bonus" wherein fathers are viewed by employers and

managers as more stable and hardworking than non-fathers and given more opportunities for promotion and more leniency for minor offenses, such as being late to work (Budig, Michelle).

In studies using fictitious resumes comparing mothers and non-mothers, the mothers were given recommended starting salaries of $11,000 less than the same resumes of non-mothers, and that's only for the 47% of mothers who were recommended for hire versus 87% of non-mothers (Correll, Shelly et. al.). This is the reason why alimony and child support make sense and is not evidence of a gynocentric society following a feminine imperative to systematically move resources from men to women. The very act of becoming a mother in a society where being a "good" mother means putting her children first makes it more difficult for a woman to support herself financially, even when we disregard the additional financial expenses of the children themselves. If a "good mother" is expected by employers to prioritize her children, then they can't expect her to prioritize her work duties.

The amount of alimony that is reasonable to award, however, is up for debate, and since not all wives are housewives and/or stay-at-home moms, there is a need for some sort of formula that allows for give-and-take to determine a proper and equitable dividing of the assets in divorce. Not all wives have sacrificed their ability to start or build their own financial security by choosing to invest in their family and marriage home, and so alimony is not always warranted even in cases where the man earns significantly more money than the woman. There should be no legal incentives to profit from divorce. I'm of the opinion that if a couple has no children and the wife has made no workplace sacrifice in order to build or maintain a type of home life beneficial to both partners, then alimony probably isn't appropriate. This is shaky ground, as many childless wives do become highly valuable "corporate wives" and essentially make an unpaid career out of managing their husband's social connections in order to support and grow his career, while other wives instead choose to focus her labors on personal passion projects that she would be otherwise unable to economically pursue. More often, in cases where the woman "married up," the reality is a bit of both.

Many divorces result in, more or less, joint physical custody of the children wherein the designated custodial parent is not paying for half of the child's food, housing, clothing, and school supplies, so child support is not always warranted even in cases where mom is designated as the custodial parent. I cannot say that I have good answers for this particular question, but I believe I can at least shed some light on the reasoning behind recent trends for greater alimony

and child support payments.

Pushes in recent decades for greater financial burdens upon men in the forms of greater alimony and child support payments stem from a 1980s study by Lenore Weitzman showing that, compared to their pre-divorce levels, women's standards of living decreased by 73% while men's increased by 43%. Women bore the brunt of the economic cost of raising children and generally had a much lower earning potential due to being a primary care-giver in the home during the marriage, and/or likely taking long breaks from the workforce, or only working part-time, while the husband would have effectively zero gaps in his work experience. After divorce, his earnings only had to support himself and pay whatever amount of support was ordered by the court. These numbers were startling and her report was one of the most cited for its subject and year, putting pressure on the family court system to revamp its alimony and child support formulas to something more equitable.

The validity of Weitzman's findings later came into question, however, when other researchers attempting to replicate her work found consistently less extreme differences in standards of living. After these discrepancies were brought to her attention, Weitzman returned to her data, reanalyzed, and discovered that her original data did, in fact, concur with the other researcher's findings that women suffered only a 27% drop in standards of living and men enjoyed only a 10% increase in standards of living. Weitzman did publically assume responsibility for the calculation mistake, but by that point the damage was done and new legislation was in the works. Nevertheless, despite the gap not being as extreme as originally thought, it was still clear that women's standard of living after divorce dropped significantly while men's increased, so it was not unreasonable for some adjustments in legislation to be made (Braver, Sanford).

To maintain both parties' pre-divorce standard of living while maintaining two households instead of one, both the man and woman would need to earn more than just their half of the marital assets and income, so it is reasonable to conclude that an equitable divorce will result in a lower standard of living for both parties, at least when assuming both parties keep their pre-divorce levels of employment.

Finding actual source material for modern post-divorce standards of living data has been difficult. One men's rights website stated that men's standard of living decreases by 10-40% after divorce, but failed to report on what women's was. Another article put the decreases at 21% for men and 45% for women, however the implication of that publication was that it was for couples who divorced after the age of 50 and whose children were, presumably at

least for a majority of participants, no longer dependent upon their parents. I've found numerous sources stating that a woman's income drops anywhere from 40% to 52% after divorce, however simple income is not the same as what family court deems to be 'standard of living,' so these numbers are not comparable. The only consistency I have been able to find while trying to answer this question of what the current post-divorce standard of living is for men and women is that men are still a bit better off than women. However, US Census data from 2015 shows that 25.8% of child support orders are only partially paid, while another 30.8% are not paid at all. I'm not dissing deadbeat Dads here—according to that same Census data, by percentage of those ordered to pay child support there is a far higher proportion of deadbeat Moms (43%) than deadbeat Dads (31%), and the nuances of post-court-order renegotiations in support amounts is rarely included in such statistics (Moonkin). However, since the majority of custodial parents are women, these lack of payments are probably contributing to her greater decrease in standard of living compared to men. The more recent data is confusing and often unreliable when it isn't completely absent, but it does seem that, overall, the recent trends in legislation have produced a more equitable division of marital assets in divorce.

What I can find clear data on is Red Pill's claim that divorced women do very well financially post-divorce because of alimony and child support. According to US Census data, 20% of women divorced within the past year are living in poverty, compared to 11% for divorced men (Census). The truth is, the economics of divorce are devastating for everyone involved… except for the lawyers.

The fact that most women get custody of the kids in a divorce proof of a Feminine Primary Order.

It is true that mothers get sole or primary custody of the children the majority of the time during a divorce, but this is not necessarily evidence of a cultural or family court system bias against fathers.

According to Census data, 17.5% of custodial parents are fathers. This does seem to show a court bias against men, until you learn that 91% of custody cases are decided by the parents without involving a judge at all, and only 1.5% of all custody cases are actually decided by a judge. Again—divorce is a complex social and legal process and the nuances of how decisions come to be made are lost in most statistics. When more comprehensive studies take the time to account for these nuances, such as the one conducted by Robert Mnookin and Eleanor Maccoby which followed over one thousand

divorcing parents from two California counties for 42 months, we can get a clearer picture of what is actually going on rather than relying on assumptions. Their overall findings mirrored rates of custody from national statistics, but the details provided in their study painted a very different picture than Red Pill claims.

80% of custody cases are settled by the parents without any outside assistance, another 11% are settled with mediation, and another 5.2% of custody cases are decided upon by the parents after a custody evaluation is completed. Only 3.7% of custody cases are ever heard by a judge, and 2.2% of those are settled by the parents during the trial. In other words, only 1.5% of custody cases are decided upon by the family court system, the other 98.5% of the time the parents voluntarily decide the outcome and all the judge is asked to do is to sign off on their consensual agreement. For the overwhelming majority of divorcing parents, the judge signing off on an agreed-upon custody and support agreement is merely a paperwork formality, and in these uncontested cases the request 71% of the time was for the mother to have sole physical custody (Mnookin p.103). This means that in total, 57% of the time custody is granted to the mother because that's what both parents decided on without any interference from the court system.

I'm going to come back to this in a second, but let's look at the 20% of cases influenced by the family court system and the 1.5% that is ultimately decided by a judge. Interestingly, the findings of this study concluded that the higher up on 'conflict pyramid' that the custody case went, the larger the percentage of custody the fathers secured. In the earlier stages of conflict where couples settle after mediation or a custody evaluation, mothers received custody approximately two-thirds of the time. For the most contested cases—the top 1.5% which had to be decided upon by a judge—the verdict was nearing 50/50 joint custody.

The data is scattered, but there is enough to paint a picture that backs this study up. The Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court Gender Bias Task Force found that 94% of the fathers who actively sought custody received sole or joint custody, regardless of whether there was a history of abuse (this particular study focused on cases with alleged and proven parental abuse) (Gender Bias). While fathers received primary custody 29% of the time, mothers received primary custody in only 7% of the contested cases (DV Leap 2013).

Custody X Change conducted a nation-wide, state-by-state study in 2017 on this 20% of contested custody cases to see how the results ended up allocating time between both parents. The criteria were simple: both parents wanted custody and there were no

complicating circumstances, such as criminal convictions or long-distance separation. Overall, twenty states averaged dads with at least 50% custody time and ten states averaged less than 25% custody time. Nationwide, dads who asked for custody ended up with 35% of it.

The "asking for it" seems to be one of the primary contributing factors to fathers getting less custody than they say they want. When mothers desired sole physical custody, they filed the appropriate petition or response with the court 80% of the time. When fathers wanted sole physical custody, they filed only 40% of the time (Mnookin p.100).

Another primary contributing factor to fathers getting less custody than they say they want is from the accumulation effect of small decisions of priority, which result in large custody consequences. Because mothers almost always take on the primary responsibility, or management role, of childcare even when both parents work full time outside the home, we see clear income disparages between otherwise equally qualified mothers and fathers. The reason for this is that mothers, having other primary responsibilities, prioritize paid work that better accommodates those responsibilities. Thus, a mother will typically chose to work closer to home, in a field that offers more flexible hours, or in other ways sacrifice her earning potential in order to prioritize her role as primary caregiver. Fathers do not typically make these sorts of sacrifices and so seek employment that is more demanding and less flexible, but compensates with higher salaries. When the parents first separate, the initial decision of where the children will live was with the mother over three-quarters of the time. The primary reasoning given for this decision was logistics, specifically regarding work schedules (Mnookin p.79).

Fathers most likely to secure their preferred joint custody were characterized by two characteristics: (1) a history of shared parenting and high parental involvement during the marriage, and (2) a strong ideological commitment to the continued involvement of both the mother and father in the child's life (Steinman; Watson). These men typically had, as most mothers do, already prioritized careers which allowed them to participate more in day-to-day parental responsibilities and so were already set up to take on more of these responsibilities after separation. These fathers prioritized regular overnight custody with their children right from the start even when their wives' objected. For most fathers, "Actually taking on primary child-rearing responsibilities would represent a substantial change… and many might wish they could do so (and express that preference in the interview) but hesitate to make the commitment even though they

genuinely wish to live with their children" (Mnookin p.102).

The uncertainly and risk of downgrading or changing their jobs during an already expensive and stressful time is daunting, and it is not at all unreasonable for fathers to wish to preserve their ability to financially provide for themselves and their children, but ultimately the prioritization of their work over their parenting involvement is a choice made. Once a living situation is established, the court system is reluctant to change it and upend the child if the child is doing well. The court system is governed by an eye towards "the best interest of the child," and if that child is thriving in its current environment, then changing the situation is counterintuitive to the court's goals. Lawyers know this and will typically council fathers not to seek joint custody if the child is doing well and overnight visits have not been part of an established routine, resulting in fewer fathers pursuing custody. Minor decisions compound over time to produce major outcomes. The living arrangement established at the outset of separation heavily influences all subsequent decisions, both of the court and of the negotiating parents.

Just the fact that unwed fathers don't have rights to their kids, but unwed mothers do, is evidence of a Feminine Primary Order.

Forty percent of children are born out of wedlock (CDC, 2019; National Vital Statistics Report), and a father who is not married to the mother has no legal rights before he chooses to actively pursue them. While this may seem unfair to fathers, it's actually holding them to the same requirements that the legal system has for mothers. Mothers always *seem* to have presumed legal rights to their children because it's pretty easy to figure out who Mom is. There is a clear chain of custody between her and the baby, and that chain of custody is almost always well documented and witnessed in modern hospitals and by modern midwives and billed to modern insurance companies.

Here is the legal issue when it comes to fathers: with parental rights come parental responsibility, and there are ethical grey areas with the legal system thrusting that level of social, emotional, and economic responsibility upon a person without due process. There are also ethical issues with the legal system granting parental custodial privileges without due process, lest some enterprising human trafficking ring decides to exploit any legal blind spots. A married man is legally presumed to be the father of a child born in wedlock because there is a legal paper trail connecting him to her and there are built-in presumed chains of custodies built into the marriage contract, but an illegitimate child must be legitimized before a father can be recognized. The court system wants a chain of custody established

before it is willing to place the burden of responsibilities that comes with the rights.

How can I possibly claim this is fair when Mom is always automatically recognized as Mom? Well—when she isn't: part of the services hospitals who host birthing mothers provide is to do all the paperwork needed to establish maternity. Mothers who choose to give birth at home must file their own paperwork to receive legal documents such as birth certificates and social security cards. A birth certificate serves as a permanent legal record that the child exists, when and where it was born, what its citizenship status is, and who its parents are. Hospitals can put down Mom's name automatically because they witnessed the baby come out of Mom. In the county of Los Angeles, for instance, mothers who gave birth at home are required to submit proof that they themselves were pregnant in the form of a signed affidavit from their doctor, they are required to bring the child with them to prove it was born alive, to also provide another affidavit saying a licensed medical professional saw a live baby and examined it within 30 days of its birth, and must also provide written witness testimony from someone who was there during the birth to prove where the birth occurred (any child born within the territory of the United States is automatically a citizen of the United States). Without all of these or acceptable substitutes, the legal system will not recognize the rights of the mother (County of Los Angeles Public Health).

In other words, parental rights in the family court system are a legal construct that must be established through legal means. Married lesbian couples are both the legal parents—one gave birth and the other is listed as the "father/parent" on the birth certificate. Even though it's biologically impossible for a biological woman to impregnate another biological woman, actual genetic parenthood is not important to the legal construct of what defines a person as a "parent." Because this lesbian is married to a woman who gave birth, she is presumed to be the legal parent of any child born to her wife. For those who adopt a child, that child is issued a new birth certificate listing who their new parents are, even if they weren't in the picture at the time of the child's birth. Just like everything else in the legal system, "parent" is a legal term with specific definitions that do not necessarily match up with our everyday vernacular. For mothers in modern-day USA, this legal paperwork process to make them a "parent" is largely invisible because modern hospitals do it as part of their Come-Here-To-Give-Birth-To-Your-Baby customer service package—legal and medical assistance all rolled into one convenient bundle. This is no different from someone purchasing a new car and the car's registration being mailed to the DMV by the dealership on

behalf of the customer—it is part of a service being paid for.

So, contrary to Red Pill's claim of the custodial problem being irrefutable evidence of a feminine primary order and of a gynocentric society, the primary custodial problem we face seems to be a self-inflicted bias against men. Self-inflicted because men are (1) not meeting the same legal chain of custody standards as women (in cases of unmarried parents), (2) not asking for custody when the issue is put to the court, and (3) prioritizing their work over their parental involvement, which results in logistical consequences that compound over time.

There is also the consideration of the self-fulfilling prophecy. Since what we see all around us is an overwhelming percentage of mothers having sole or primary custody, we assume that is the inevitable outcome when the question of custody comes up. Fathers assume they will not be given what they want and so they don't pursue it as much as they otherwise would, or flat-out don't ask for it. Most of the stories I hear from men are a far cry from apathy towards wanting to spend time with their children and nothing even close to what I would expect to hear from 'deadbeat dads,' but instead more a story of how they initially started out with the intention of seeking custody only to be frustrated and overwhelmed with the obstacles, legalese, cost, and other difficulties of dealing with the system during an emotionally difficult period. Between all of that and the belief that the court wouldn't favor them anyway, they threw up their hands and signed the settlement just to get it over with and to prevent further costs and losses from piling up.

They are not wrong to be concerned about these costs: Custody X Change found that while lawyering up did increase the chance of getting joint custody, it also increased the cost of the divorce from $500 to $18,000. Shelling out thousands of dollars when you're already convinced that you won't get what you want seems insane, but then again—is lawyering up even necessary? 80% of fathers with council filed a formal request for custody, compared to only 21% of fathers without council (Mnookin p.111). It begs the question of just how much of the increase in custody was because of the simple act of filling out a form?

Later, as the full implications of their actions—or, rather, inactions—become apparent, a deep regret, sadness, and anger overcomes the father who is not able to spend the kind of time with his child as he wants and believes he should. The father suffers, and the child suffers. The facts on how critical fathers are to their children's well-being and future success and happiness are well established and not in dispute between myself and Red Pill, so there is

no need to rehash them here.

As a person who has worked with the legal system, I can attest that it is convoluted, confusing, and not even remotely user-friendly. However, this is also true of parenting. If Red Pill were truly invested in ending fatherlessness and helping fathers get more custody of their children, then Red Pill would look at the same data I've looked at and would council men on how to have more of their own lives within their own hands by simply doing the legal steps needed to get what they want, because the vast majority of fathers who either go through the legal steps to become the legal father or who ask for more visitation ultimately get what they ask for.

If more men who want custody were empowered with the knowledge that they're more than likely to get it, I suspect we'd see more joint custody settlements when Mom realizes she's going to lose the hire-a-lawyer-game-of-chicken both parents play when they haggle over custody. Mom doesn't want to shell out $18,000 either, and she is simply betting that Dad gives in first.

Instead, Red Pill insists that men are victims of a system and social order out to get them and advises men to never have marriages or children, lest they risk losing them to that system through divorce rape. Red Pill tells men that this is just the way that reality is and it's outside their control, so best to opt out if you can and cut your losses if you can't. Red Pill doesn't know how to Science, how to History, or even how to Legal.

While I'll be the first to point out that the American legal system has its flaws, making rulings on issues it hasn't been asked to make rulings on isn't one of them. A judge being presented with an already agreed-upon custody arrangement has no reason to question its legitimacy. When Red Pill blames judges and the family court system for accepting parent's agreement in 98.5% of custody cases because those agreements do not give the equal time a father never asked for, it is the same as when extreme feminists claim it was the man's responsibility to know a woman wasn't as willing as she portrayed herself to be.

Just like all other rights, parental rights must be exercised, defended, and maintained if you want to keep them. It is no one's responsibility to defend your own interests except yourself. Women are not the 'default' parents in the reality of parental custody: 98.5% of agreements are made between the parents without a judge, and 83% of those consensual agreements make Mom the custodial parent. This means that, in over 79% of all divorce cases, Dad is not willing, for whatever reason, to be an equal parent to his own children. At least, not willing enough to try.

This is confirmed: 82.5% of Dads are non-custodial, and of those 48% see their children less than once per month or not at all (Livingston, Gretchen, 2011). A tiny portion of these are going to be because a judge said so, or because Mom moved the kids too far away to visit regularly, but the vast majority of the time it's because Dad is not willing to prioritize being in his child's life more than he is willing to prioritize other things. Hemming and hawing over the bias and injustice of the family court system is a self-fulfilling prophecy that ultimately just rationalizes this lack of willingness to prioritize being in their children's lives.

Discarding official and pre-set legal reasons (such as 'irreconcilable differences'), the number one reason couples gave for getting a divorce was "lack of commitment," with this reason being cited in as much as 94% of couples in some studies (Scott, Shelby; Amato, P.R.; Hawkins, Alan). In other words, for whatever reason, they were not willing to fight for the relationship. Infidelity, arguing, and financial issues were all significantly lower on the list of reasons given, although there was a good deal of overlap. This wasn't all one sided—roughly 70% of couples both agreed that "lack of commitment" was the problem, generally pointing to the other partner as the source of the lack of commitment. Either way, we're looking at a high level of apathy amongst divorcing couples rather than a high level of more concrete problems.

Let's look really close at those percentages again: 82.5% of non-custodial fathers have either zero contact or very little contact with their children and did not put up any measurable fight to be in their children's lives. This includes both never-married and divorced Dads with divorced non-custodial dads coming in at 55% having zero or very little contact with their children. Let's really think about the mindset and level of noncommittal parental input it takes to prioritize not dealing with ass-ache enough for it to trump being a parent to your own children. That kind of apathy towards their children doesn't just spring up because Mom filed for divorce—it's a gradual thing, and just like not contributing at all to housework, it's going to be the sort of thing that is a symptom of a larger relationship problem.

For the minority of children living with their divorced fathers, a very similar picture emerges with just over 50% having zero or little contact with their mothers, yet we don't assume that the court system is preventing them from being more involved with their own children. We assume that the mothers are prioritizing things other than being involved with their children's lives, and we would be correct.

Is it really any shock that in these failed relationships, including relationships where 79% of fathers didn't even file a custody

request form, that Mom has to be the one to initiate divorce 80% of the time? If Dad is showing a pattern of preferring not to be there and is prioritizing things other than his family, can we blame Mom for leaving? Is it really Mom who left, or was it just Mom who had enough together to do the paperwork?

More research would be needed to fill in the gaps of the data to confirm my theory, but the available research just doesn't seem to offer much other explanation as to why divorced fathers are not fathering their kids beyond the theory that they're not prioritizing doing so. I suspect that a subset of married father's apathy towards their children is contributing to their divorces, rather than divorce is causing more fatherlessness. The data is showing that fathers who live with their children are spending more and more time with them than in years past—which is great—while mothers are still spending about twice as much time as fathers are (Livingston, Gretchen, 2011). Since so many mothers choose to stay at home or work part time to focus more on the children, this number would be reasonably skewed towards mothers, and I can't say that egalitarianism is even a healthy goal. There is a strong trend of more Dads getting more involved, at least while the parents are still married, and yet a high percentage of fathers living apart are barely involved with their kid's lives, assuming they are involved at all. However, if my theory is correct and women are initiating divorce more often than men because those specific men are being apathetic towards their own children, then what we should see from future data is something similar to the housework issue: fathers whose wives perceive them as spending little or no time parenting their children are more likely to get divorced, while more hours fathers spend with their child overall does not correlate with a decreased divorce risk.

This does beg the question of "if this theory is true, then why are more men getting apathetic than women?" While less common, we've seen that deadbeat Moms do exist, and tend to be even more deadbeat than deadbeat Dads, so women certainly have no moral high ground on this topic. My only explanation for this would be to say that women pay a much higher social price than men for being a deadbeat or 'bad parent,' just like men pay a much higher social price than women for choosing to be a stay-at-home parent. I don't think that women initiating divorce 80% of the time is saying that women are checking out of the relationship less than men, only that the ways in which she is checking out are likely different. This is all speculation on my part, but since Mom will pay a much higher social price for neglecting the kids, she is less likely to do so. And since Mom becomes more and more the person doing the majority of the parenting as both parents become more and more apathetic, she is feeling disrespected

and unappreciated by Dad's apathy more and more. Since she knows she's going to be the primary caregiver to the kids and has the constant disincentive to stay in the relationship because of those feelings of being unappreciated and being taken for granted, she is more likely to be the one to start the paperwork. In my theory, Mom's apathy is directed towards her husband and their relationship specifically, while Dad's apathy is directed more towards the household in general.

Where I will agree that there is rampant sexism against fathers is not in the legal system, but in the Western culture at large. Women may be penalized professionally because they actively parent, but men are punished socially for actively parenting. More and more men's public restrooms are getting baby-changing stations, but they are standard in women's. This assumes that dads are not doing the parenting and forces caregiving Dads into doing contortions just to keep their kids sanitary. The sheer sexism fathers (including my husband) deal with while parenting their children without their wives nearby sends a pretty clear message that fathers are not seen as important as mothers (BBC Trending). This includes near catcalling-levels of comments such as "Playing Mom today?", "Doing some babysitting?", or even "It's so great to see such an involved father!"

This is a matter of perception: some men enjoy the extra social attention they receive when acting as the primary caregiver, equating it to feeling "a bit like a rock star walking through downtown with a baby on my chest" (Solomon, Catherine p.79), while men like my husband see the assumption that he would be less involved or less interested in his children as patronizing. This can dip into intimidation and harassment when bystanders assume unchaperoned Dads have malicious intent, simply for the crime of being a grown man who spends time with children.

The often guilty-until-proven-innocent way men who spend time around children are treated is also a clear symptom of Western culture's anti-father sexism. Fathers who take an active role in caregiving are often viewed with suspicion by others. Their failure to "do gender correctly" already casts them in the light of a deviant and something to comment on. In the worst of cases, "The deviant nature of these men's role over-sexualized their interactions with mothers and criminalized their mere presence around children" (Solomon, Catherine p.88).

Fortunately, the sheer increase in paternal involvement and the increasing numbers of stay-at-home-dads does seem to be changing the social attitudes towards the "appropriate" way that men are allowed to "do gender." Recent interviews with stay-at-home-dads

show they are being more accepted and welcomed into their peer communities (“mommy groups”) and that they are receiving more and more support from other men, and in particular their own fathers and family members (Solomon, Catherine).

For me, the overall social message being sent to men is that, despite being capable in every other aspect of their lives, they are not capable of doing any parenting by themselves. For many men, the social message is that fathers only “babysit” temporarily until the true and rightful parent shows up. There does seem to be evidence, thankfully, that this message is changing. Either way, while I refute Red Pill’s claim of a legal feminine primary order intent on transferring property from men to women, I don’t have to look very hard to find anti-father sexism in the Western culture at large.

War Brides, or What's Rape got to do with it, Evolutionarily Speaking?

"Sooner or later you're going to realize, just as I did, there's a difference between knowing the path and walking the path."
- Morpheus 'The Matrix' (1999)

Red Pill has a thing for war brides and Stockholm syndrome. It's an obsession that simply won't die and I genuinely do not understand how it persists in the community as tenaciously as it does. To contrast Red Pill's belief that women are incapable of pair bonding with men after they've had sex with too many of them, Red Pill also holds the simultaneous and contradicting belief that women are evolutionarily predisposed to easily discard their exes because they just fall in love with the next guy too quickly.

Basically, the idea is that because tribal humans were so keen to go raiding their neighboring tribal humans, women were regularly captured, raped, and forced to be the long-term wives of their captors. To give them the ability to survive in this horrible situation, women evolved the ability to quickly emotionally disconnect from previous sexual partners and bond with the next guy. This is supposedly plays out today when women move on so much more quickly than men after a breakup. This seems to contradict the alpha-widow theory, but perhaps Red Pill men believe a woman's risk of being alpha-widowed disappears if her current relationship isn't consensual?

We should spend some time talking about what Stockholm syndrome is and isn't before we fully unpack this Red Pill theory. The term came into existence in 1973 when four hostages were taken captive during a bank robbery in Stockholm, Sweden. Six days later, the hostages were released, but all four refused to testify against their captor and instead began to raise money for his defense. Stockholm syndrome is not about falling in love with your captor necessarily, but more about coming to sympathize with them and coming to believe in the humanity of your captor. Stockholm syndrome is when, if you will, a captor's victims enter the captor's Frame. It is not an actual diagnosis and instead more of a pop-culture idea. It has not been included in the DSM-5 (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders) because of the lack of consistent academic research on the

topic. According to the FBI, only about 5% of hostage victims later show symptoms of Stockholm syndrome. Of the four hostages held captive in the Stockholm bank robbery, three were women and one was a man (Klein).

In other words, mental trauma is not a gendered thing. Men get Stockholm syndrome. Furthermore, it wasn't just women getting carted away by neighboring warlords: men were taken as slaves all the time in war and would have developed Stockholm syndrome as a survival mechanism. If you fight or resist your captors, you get beaten into submission. That's just the reality of the situation and when there is zero chance of rescue or escape, it's in your best interest to find something to like about your captors quickly so that you get beaten less. Trauma bonding is more complicated than this and the nuances are beyond the scope of this book, but ultimately the idea is that a victim jumps through a few mental hoops in order to finds ways to be grateful to their abuser for the times when the abuse is lessoned. Generally, women get raped into submission and men get beaten into submission. Even today, that pattern hasn't changed when it comes to prisoners of war. We're all prone to Stockholm syndrome, given the right set of circumstances. This is psychological trauma, not normal psychological reactions.

The only data-based evidence I've been able to find that addresses this question of who moves on faster after a break-up is a joint study done by the University College London and Binghamton University. The study surveyed 5,700 individuals who had experienced breakups and found that women were the ones who experienced more emotional and even physically manifested pain immediately after a breakup, but that women did eventually emotionally recover more quickly and ended up emotionally stronger than men did. The study found that many men never fully recovered after a break-up—they simply learned how to move on (Morris, Reiber).

First, while this study does show a strong argument for women having it rougher immediately after a breakup, the data is also pretty clear that men also have it rough immediately after a breakup. This data is not suggesting that men are celebrating after breaking up with their significant other. The study also suggests an evolutionary explanation—namely that women become more emotionally invested in a relationship because of the potential for pregnancy, but it does not offer a suggestion on why more men emotionally stagnate after a break-up beyond the suggestion that men who don't stagnate are simply higher-quality men with more resources who will more quickly find a replacement mate.

I have a different theory. Some interesting facts to add to this conversation is that the number-one reason listed for breakups in the above study by both men and women was “lack of communication.” Also, three times as many women as men participated in the study. I don’t think that women are wired to move on quicker, and I don’t think men are wired to move on quicker. What I do see is exes of both genders acting purposefully dismissive and aloof when they happen to run into each other after a breakup, or playing games like posting pictures of themselves with a new date so their ex will see it. It’s not difficult for me to see how men who find Red Pill can get sucked into this belief that women are simply designed to move on faster than they are. It’s going to ‘feel’ right because it’s a repeated personal experience, especially if the men don’t acknowledge that they also act aloof during these interactions and instead are left with the persistent thoughts of “how did she move on so fast? Did I really mean that little to her? Was our entire relationship a lie?”

When a relationship ends and we are the ones getting dumped, it’s highly likely that our ex is the one who will be moving on first. Whoever decides to break up the relationship gets over it much earlier than the other person. It doesn’t matter if they’re male or female. This is because the person declaring the break up has already had some time to mull over and conclude this is the best option for them. The person on the other end of that decision typically has more trouble with it because they haven’t had the same lead up and mental preparation time.

One of the best ways to test a hypothesis is to flip the question around and see if the answer sticks. So, Red Pill has asked “why would women evolve to move on from a relationship more quickly than men?” and come up with the theory of war brides. I’m going to ask the question, “Why would men evolve to languish emotionally after a break-up?” After all, divorced men are eight times more likely to commit suicide than divorced women (Kposowa, AJ). What possible evolutionary benefit could there be to an eight-fold increase in suicide rates compared to women? To assume that men represent the “standard” human response and it’s women’s “variation” that needs to be explained is, by Red Pill’s own definition, quite a solipsistic way of approaching the question.

I can see an argument that men may have a harder time getting over a break-up. Not because of any innate male idealism causing them to fall deeper in love than women (as believed by Red Pill), but instead because men have the tendency to limit their emotional support systems to just their romantic partners, while women are a lot more comfortable receiving emotional support from a

larger network of friends and family. This is a result of cultural norms that tell men they have to be stoic to be manly and that sharing emotions, being vulnerable, and seeking emotional support from other men makes them gay and feminine. It's a big problem, but it has nothing to do with war brides or any tendency in women to be more dismissive towards their men and everything to do with the majority of men being too insecure to risk others seeing their very human vulnerabilities. A "lack of communication" is, essentially, a failure of social connections.

I suspect what we are seeing with this data is that women go through a more difficult initial breakup because (1) culturally they have more permission to actually engage with and process their emotions about a break-up, and (2) because of this more permissive cultural environment, they have more practice in working through their emotions. This allows women to get over a break-up faster and be in a better emotional state further down the road compared to men, but it has everything to do with culture and environment rather than evolutionary adaptations. I don't think men even recognize these things as important because I believe men have been repeatedly lied to their entire lives about how unimportant their emotional health is.

Let's take the example of being a kid and looking forward to Christmas: when you are a child, Christmas is something magical that just happens. A tree appears in the living room, fantastic displays light up the neighborhood at night, families show up for feasts and treats, and wrapped gifts pile up. It's not until you become an adult that you realize that someone *makes* Christmas happen. Mom and/or Dad did the shopping, did the cleaning, did the cooking and the baking, organized the extended family for a get-together, wrapped the presents, and put up the decorations. Making Christmas happen is a lot of work—not just physical work like hauling a tree into the living room or groceries into the kitchen, but also mental and emotional work like organizing family schedules, making sure the menu doesn't have allergy triggers, ensuring everyone who send a Christmas card last year gets a Christmas card this year and… do we have all the updated addresses? Gift-giving is a skill that requires investment and care to give thoughtful and wanted gifts that still fit within a budget. When the person who does these things suddenly isn't there anymore, "Christmas" can't happen.

It's certainly a cliché that men immediately after a break-up fantasize about or believe that they're going to be able to party and sleep around with lots of women and have a grand-all time now that they're "free," but I do think it may take men a while after a breakup to realize why they decided to get into a relationship in the first place

—specifically, because being single isn't all that it's cracked up to be. If it were, wouldn't men choose to remain single? Fantasy isn't reality, it can just seem more appealing when you've taken your reality for granted.

The fact is, many men simply have not invested in a social infrastructure that puts supportive relationships around themselves. They rely on women to do this emotional and mental labor of maintaining a social support structure. So when a break-up happens, she keeps all the friends because she's been the one maintaining all the friendships. This means she can still have a "Christmas," but he can't. The breakup isn't even, and there is a gendered bias.

This not only puts a great deal of unfair pressure on the women in these relationships, but is also leaves men in a dangerous situation compared to women when dealing with the psychological trauma of a break-up. If you think this isn't a big deal and is just the result of men naturally being more stoic than women and not requiring as much social and emotional support, then let me tell you that it's getting worse: in 1990 45% of men under 30, when faced with a difficult problem, reached out to their friends first. As of 2021, that number has dropped to 22% (APS). It wasn't just the pandemic—these numbers have been in steady decline for years.

Today, twenty-eight percent of men under thirty report having zero significant social connections. We've already talked about how evolution is something very slow and gradual—human males did not evolve to become 23% more stoic in thirty years. It is very likely that women have evolved to need a larger social support network than men—but that doesn't mean that men need no social support network.

I believe this gender disparity in long-term emotional health post-break-up is the result of a culture and environment denying men the basic emotional support they need to be healthy. Men have been conditioned to put all their emotional-needs eggs in one basket, and that basket is their romantic partner. Many men are not putting in the time and emotional labor needed to build their own support structure to meet their own needs. What's worse is they are being trained to neglect their emotional health by being socially shamed if they seek out emotional support and dare to show vulnerability outside of a romantic partner. It's not fair, and it's toxic to men and to the women who love them. Ultimately, this is a change that men need to make within their own culture and male-space. I'm not saying that men need to become more like women or get in touch with their feminine side—I'm saying men need to embrace their masculinity and finally get in touch with their masculine emotions.

I don't believe this looks like men weeping in the streets,

which is what I'm usually accused of prescribing at this point. I believe this looks like men being able to go to each other with problems that are stereotypically not masculine—problems with invasive and repetitive thoughts of low self-worth, problems with not being confident with women, problems with not knowing what their role is as a father or as a partner or as a son. I believe this looks like the other men listening, and validating, and helping his friend find perspective and strategies to work through the possible solutions. I believe this looks like men willing to be vulnerable with their weaknesses instead of feeling they must project a mask in order to be accepted.. I believe this looks like groups of men acknowledging that no one can be an island, and so not fighting the need to be dependent upon each other to figure out this life thing. Once we reach a certain age, it becomes our responsibility to unlearn behaviors that hinder our growth as a person. If we've been lied to our entire lives about what our needs are or aren't, sometimes it takes someone from the outside to help us identify it. It may not be our fault that our society is like this, but it is our responsibility to deal with it.

What about Genghis Khan? Doesn't he prove that women like aggressive, alpha men?

Everyone wants to bring up Khan or Cortés. Fine, but don't kid yourself—women didn't choose Khan. Khan and a number of his male relatives raped their way across every land mass they ever stepped foot on, and that's where his genetic legacy comes from. Khan was a highly unusual sociopath. Rape is a part of our history. It's unpleasant, but it's there. It's also a part of our genetic legacy—but not by much, according to the evidence.

Whenever some Red-Pill detractor brings up Courtney Cox, Shania Twain, Cindy Crawford, Jennifer Aniston, Kathy Ireland, Sheryl Crow, Gina Gershon, or any of the many other older female celebrities still considered smoking hot and highly fuckable despite being post-wall, Red Pill rebuts with the concept of 'the exception proves the rule.' In other words, it's *because* these women are considered exceptional in their level of sexiness for their age that they actually prove the rule that older women are not sexually attractive. This rebuttal applies to Khan as well.

There are species, such as waterfowl, whose males primarily have a non-consensual mating strategy. These species end up in an evolutionary cold war between the males and females, with females evolving contorted obstacle courses in their reproductive tracts to try and misdirect the forced mating, and males evolving corkscrewed and huge penises to force their ways through the obstacles. Alternatively,

female chickens are able to “spit out” unwanted ejaculate (Birkhead, T.R.) and female dolphins have complicated vaginal folds which can trap and deflect an unwanted male’s penis (Orbach, Dara).

Humans do not show anything that extreme in our biology—but we do have something interesting. Women do show consistent sexual responses when shown pretty much any sexual stimulus, particularly violent sexual stimulus. She’s not turned on mentally, but she will get wet. Does that mean all women have rape fantasies they secretly wish to have played out? Are women predisposed to be sexually attracted to hyper masculine and aggressive men, as many Red Pill advocates claim? No—it’s far more likely to mean that women who were able to secrete some lubrication during assaults or other unwanted matings were less likely to die or suffer infertility from tearing and infection after the assault (Chivers, M.L.; Suschinsky, Kelly). There are no known physiological characteristics that protect a human woman from becoming pregnant from non-consensual sex.

Rape and war brides have been a thing—they just doesn’t seem to have been that much of a reproductively successful thing, or we’d see more evidence of long-term non-consensual mating in our biology like we do with other species who have long-term non-consensual mating strategies. Fortunately for us, it seems our men prefer their women to be willing.

Rape in humans is really rather interesting, evolutionarily speaking. Obviously, rape is a horrendous crime and nothing in this chapter should be taken out of context to say it isn’t, but the reason I say it’s not a big deal is because, genetically speaking, it’s not. Behaviorally, culturally—it’s a huge deal, but rape doesn’t seem to have made that much of an impact on our genetic legacy. The complete dearth of physical evidence is telling.

Species who use non-consensual mating as a regular mating strategy show signs of it in their basic biology, like the ducks and other waterfowl I mentioned. Women do show some genetic adaptations to the physical trauma of rape, but not any protection from insemination from rape, and men, if anything, show evidence of evolutionary pressure to not rape.

Put a man in front of the same violent sexual videos that they put the women in front of and he won’t get an erection, or at least not much of one, and he won’t be able to maintain it. If he did, we’d think there was something psychologically very wrong with him, and we’d be right because it’s literally abnormal for our species. Even convicted rapists show significantly higher sexual responses to consensual sexual stimuli than to non-consensual stimuli, indicating that rape is more a matter of increased tolerance for negative stimulation rather than a

preferred stimulus (Harris, Grant).

This is an example of different environmental pressures on men and women of the same species and evolution only acting on the gender being affected—women got raped a lot more than men and so developed a defense against suffering too much damage from the assault, but it so rarely led to offspring that men never bothered to develop any triggers or preferences for rape. In other words, men with a greater inclination to rape did not produce more children than men who had a lower inclination to rape. So—rape serves a significant behavioral/environmental function, because we see evolutionary adaptations to it, but not a significant reproductive one, because we don't see evolutionary preferences for it. Healthy men do not respond sexually to women in pain or fear. Human men like their women to like what they're doing to them (Baxter, D.J.).

One thing feminism has given us a greater understanding about is the concept that rape is not about sex or reproduction—rape is about power and control. It's a dominance move, and a cruel one at that. The data is spotty, but from what we can tell, most rapists never ejaculate. Rape victims self-report significant levels of erectile dysfunction and impotence in their attackers, and the rates increase with the violence experienced (Jones, JS; Bownes, IT).

I personally spent four years working in a forensic laboratory. Every single rape kit from multiple counties passed through my hands during that time. At least in my laboratory and in the laboratory of every forensic DNA scientist I've ever spoken with, semen is found in less than half of them. There are a lot of factors involved in this, including time since assault, but the end result is the same. One of the reasons rape cases are so hard to prosecute is because there often isn't any physical evidence left behind (Stone, Ken). If rape was an effective strategy for reproduction, then men would show physical signs of arousal in response to sexual violence just as much as women do. Or rapists would at least be able to ejaculate most of the time. Rape is about control, not sex.

So why is rape still a thing if it didn't serve an evolutionary function in times of war?

Because it serves an important social function. If rape were simply a reproductive strategy, as it is in many species, then the rape of men by other men wouldn't be as prevalent as it is. One in every ten rape victims is male, and the overwhelming majority of their assailants are also male (RAINN; Greathouse, Sarah; NISVS). Since rape is about control and not sex, the reproductive potential of the victim isn't a primary consideration in the choice of victim. According

to the CDC, more than 1 in 3 women have experienced sexual violence, which includes physical contact, in her lifetime. Nearly 1 in 4 men have experienced the same (CDC). While a female victim is a much easier target physically, the additional social stigma suffered by male rape victims means the attacker can yield this strategy to a greater effect. We have evidence of this tactic of men forcibly raping other men being used as a means of control all the way back to the Bible (Judges 19:20).

Rape, including the use of male-on-male rape, has a very interesting function in times of war—you may be interested in reading the book "On Killing" by Lt. Col. Dave Grossman, where he goes into the psychology of war rape pretty heavily. It's required reading at the FBI, which is how I found it. Anyway, rape has traditionally been used as a tool of war to achieve two things: (1) to strike terror in the people you are fighting, and (2) as a male bonding technique.

Historically, war rape is only seen in significant numbers in conscripted armies—armies made up of men who would rather not be there. Interestingly, the only time the USA has had a significant PR issue with our soldiers raping our enemies or committing other acts of atrocity was in Vietnam, or the only war we've ever fought where our army was conscripted. The rest of the time our men volunteered to be soldiers, and while rape occurred in isolated incidents, for the most part, it wasn't an issue.

Rape, and other acts of atrocity, is such a huge taboo for our species that the men know they won't be accepted by their people back home unless they go home a victor. Purposefully harming another for no reason other than your own benefit is a species-wide no-no, and there are some mental gymnastics that must be done in order to rationalize it. Generally, the enemy or the "other" must be dehumanized and/or demonized to justify the acts of atrocity. The acts must be made, somehow, the other's fault. The means of defeating the one responsible for the acts of atrocity are always justified when the enemy is defeated. The men know they won't be able to justify it in their own heads unless they can justify it with a victory. It bonds a group of unwilling men together in the common goal of winning a war. It makes them fight harder—because once they have raped, once they have been peer-pressured or outright ordered into an act of atrocity, they can't go home unless they win.

In order to bond these men together, the individual men's morality is removed and replaced, through guilt and supplied logic, with a morality that best serves the leader. Even today, one of the most common initiations for joining a gang involves the applicant committing a crime or an act of violence against another

(Descormiers, Karine). Once these men go down that path, there is no turning back, and their individual fate is intrinsically linked to the group's.

Red Pill often talks about "hypergamy triggers" or "hypergamy hacks." Implicating men in shared crimes is a loyalty trigger. It is a loyalty hack.

> Those who command atrocities are powerfully bonded by blood and guilt to those who commit atrocities, and to their cause, since only the success of their cause can ensure that they will not have to answer for their actions. With totalitarian dictators, it is their secret police and other such Praetorian guard-type units who can be counted on to fight for their leader and their cause to the bitter end. Nichoae Ceauşescu's state police in Romania and Hitler's SS units are two such examples of units bonded to their leaders by atrocities.
>
> By ensuring that their men participate in atrocities, totalitarian leaders can also ensure that for these minions there is no possibility of reconciliation with the enemy. They are inextricably linked to the fate of their leader. Trapped in their logic and their guilt, those who commit atrocities see no alternatives other than total victory or total defeat in a great Götterdämmerung." (Lt. Col. Dave Grossman p. 213)

But pregnancy does occur from many rapes.

Yes, it does, and at roughly the same rates as unprotected consensual sex results in pregnancy (Gottchchall, J.A.; Wilcox, A.J). Here we need to make some subtle distinguishing definitions about rape as it applies to evolutionary theory and to my theory in particular.

The most commonly applied method of rape in the human species is not the violent physical force that we usually think of when we think 'rape.' Coercion is the tactic used by most abusers to get their unwilling victims to agree to sex. Both culturally and legally, "coercion" is recognized as "sexual assault," but physiologically the violence and force of what we think of when we picture a back-alley rape is very different from the confusion, bargaining, or simple dread a victim experiences during coercive rape. What I have been discussing up until now in this chapter is the violent, physical rape by strangers, as would be the case in the types of assault and situations usually referred to within Red Pill communities when these discussions come up. That type of sexual assault does not seem to have

been a significant part of our species' evolution for the reasons I've already talked about. Coercive rape, however, is an entirely different ball game.

I am going to just briefly touch on this here because this is part of a much larger conversation of the implications of the philosophy of Red Pill that I will be building over the next several chapters. Let's explore some of the ways in which coercive rape, which does result in pregnancy at roughly the same frequency as consensual sex and thus is a part of our evolutionary history, plays out:

- Using guilt as a way to manipulate an unwilling victim into having sex. This includes implying or stating the abuser is "owed" sex because of some reason, such as the abuser bought them dinner or did them a favor, or suggesting that the victim isn't living up to their obligations unless they provide sex.
- Pestering the victim by repeatedly asking for sex, sometimes verbally but usually physically, even after consent has been denied, until the victim gives in.
- Either waiting until the victim is unable to give consent because of voluntary intoxication or manipulating the victim into consuming drugs or alcohol until the victim is unable to refuse the abuser.
- Withholding or threatening to withhold money or other needs unless the victim agrees to have sex.
- Threatening to leave the victim or to cheat on the victim if sex is not provided.

I am purposefully using "victim" and "abuser" here because coercion is the primary tactic used by women to rape men as well as for men to rape women and for anyone to rape anyone. Sexual assault is not a "women's issue." Sexual assault is an issue that affects everyone and can occur to anyone. Because we're talking about evolutionary biology and psychology, I am necessarily focusing on male perpetrators and female victims, but in no way do I want to give the impression that that is the only type of rape that regularly occurs.

Now, coercive sex is one of those taboo subjects that many men don't feel they can question or ask clarification for, so I will address it in more detail before moving on. Many well-meaning and reasonable men feel that modern politically correct definitions of "coercive rape" are too broad and cover instances that are not truly "rape" and instead are actually consensual sex, leading to many ruined lives after malicious women falsely accuse a man of rape. After all—she said yes, right?

False allegations of rape do occur and to suggest that they don't is to imply that women are too stupid to recognize the power these charges have to inflict maximum damage on their male enemies. Women are not stupid, and these types of malicious and false charges do happen. However, that doesn't mean that the definitions of coercive rape are covering legitimately consensual sexual encounters.

When I was studying at my state's police academy to earn my law enforcement certification, this topic came up. What our instructor said seemed to convince the questioning men in the front row of their error, so I will repeat her scenario here:

> *You're on a date with a woman. Things have been going great. You bought her dinner, you've taken a walk around the park, and she's been flirting with you and sending you all sorts of signals that she's interested in taking things further. In fact, her flirtation and teasing and her frequency of initiating physical contact with you (touching your arm, etc.) have been steadily increasing throughout the evening. She has made numerous innuendos indicating she's down to fuck. You are stoked. You suggest driving over to the well-known "make-out point" your town has and she enthusiastically agrees. You know you're in at this point. You get there, start making out, and just when you feel you're about to burst from the tension, you make your move.*
>
> *She shifts away, giggles and says, "Oh, I'm not that kind of girl."*
>
> *What is your response?*

The immediate and unanimous reply from the questioning men at the front of the class was, "Get the fuck out of my car, you teasing bitch."

This greatly pleased our instructor, who said "Yes—'get the fuck out of my car you teasing bitch' is the correct answer. The incorrect answer is to say to yourself, 'Fuck you—I'm getting mine' and then proceed to say or do whatever is needed to make sex happen."

That's the difference between rape and not-rape.

Moving on, if we look again at the bullet points for coercive rape, we see that these are all, at their core, bargaining techniques. The victim isn't scared necessarily, or at least not on the fear-panic-fight-or-flight level that a violent physical rape induces. She is involved in a negotiation.

Ultimately, when you break it down, coercive sex is a transaction. The currency being offered for sex in this transaction might be as minor as "I'll stop bugging you and annoying you" or as blunt as "I won't starve you to death if you play along," but from a

physiological standpoint, the man's body can't tell the difference between a bargain struck that she's okay with or a bargain struck that she's not okay with. On a grand level, how manipulative or morally wrong or how little practical choice the woman has in that transaction is something that evolutionary selection doesn't care about, even though ethical and moral individuals should. Evolutionary selection, as we've already seen, does not give a shit about an individual's welfare.

The lack of active consent and/or lack of enthusiasm these women give in these transactional relationships does not seem to trigger the widespread erectile dysfunction and inability to ejaculate that we see in cases of violent rape (Jones, JS; Bownes, IT).

I have nothing to back this theory up, but I suspect this is the result of a powerful evolutionary selection *against* violent rape, not for it as Red Pill claims. Khan very much won the game of getting his genetics into as many babies as possible, but typically men who use rape as a reproductive tactic have the consequence of getting hunted down and killed by their victim's husbands, brothers, and fathers. Khan was one of the very few serial rapists who survived long enough to make it a winning strategy, but his reproductive success was a flash in the pan and has, apparently, not been consistently successful enough to have established a genetic foothold.

In my model, women who were able to utilize transactional sex, even when she wasn't particularly attracted to the man, were able to attain needed resources and lower interpersonal tensions. It makes sense that male psychological strategies to try and control the outcome of that negotiation as much as possible would develop, resulting in the near universal rates of sexual harassment and coercion experienced by women, starting in childhood (Hlavka, Heather).

I feel I should add a disclaimer here that nothing in this chapter or this book should be taken as justification for questioning the validity of a violent rape claim based solely on if it resulted in a pregnancy. Outliers always happen, and there are plenty of cases where women have been impregnated from violent rapists who had no problems ejaculating. What I am trying to illustrate is that the tactic of "violent rape" as a species-wide *reproductive strategy* has not been selected for on an evolutionary scale, and in my opinion has been selected against, the evidence for which I have already discussed. The tactic of "coercive rape" as a reproductive strategy, which for now I am calling a transaction, either has been selected for or has not been selected against during our evolution.

This in no way means that coercive sex is "right" or that pregnancy is impossible in "legitimate" rape cases, and in no way

implies that men are incapable of telling the difference between a moral and immoral act. It is highly unlikely that the bloodied female ducks who narrowly escape drowning after being forced into sex by a dozen males enjoy the experience (Biederman, Patricia), or that the male praying mantis enjoys being eaten alive during successful copulation. Just because sex or a particular reproductive strategy is "natural" to a species does not mean the individuals enjoy it, it only means that Mother Nature is a bitch who doesn't give a damn.

Rape is about sex, not power. If rape were about power, then old women would get raped just as often as young women.

I'm going to contrast this to a scenario Red Pill loves to use themselves: an overly entitled woman who expects men to bend over backwards to please her and to buy her things, and so on. In her mind, in her own internal narrative, this woman is simply having standards and insisting she be treated well. For those outside her mind, it's all about her and her ego, and the man providing these things may as well be an inanimate object for all she cares about him. For those of us on the outside, we recognize her behavior as delusional and entitled.

So, yes, to the rapist, rape is about sex. And they feel entitled to sex. And they disproportionately target sexually appealing women and girls, because what they want is sex. In a paper exploring the reasoning and self-rationalization of convicted rapists, 80% of rapists don't think they are rapists at all. The other 20% admit that they raped... but do not believe that raping makes them a rapist (Scully, Diana).

The entitled woman is never going to admit that her behavior is really about entitlement. To her, it isn't. To her, it's about having high standards and wanting to be treated well. She is seeking the external validation that every human being needs and she equates being loved with being fawned over. To everyone else, her entitlement is about her delusions that she's better than everyone else and it's about her trying to get something that hasn't been freely offered.

Just like the entitled woman objectifies men and manipulates them into filling her own needs against their best interests, so, too, do rapists objectify and manipulate women. The rapist feels sex to be an actual need because they equate sex with external validation, and external validation is a legitimate need of every human being. However, the rapist also cannot differentiate between a woman's will and her actions, which is how the cliché, but common, narrative of "dressed like that, she was asking for it" is justified. When the rapist forces the actions of women, in their minds, they also force the will of

women; “She ended up enjoying it” (Scully, Diana). But love, and the validation that is so closely tied to sex, cannot be negotiated. It can only be freely given. When rapists turn women into objects they control, they fail to differentiate acts of love and validation from acts of obedience and submission. Through the act of denying women’s free will and treating them as an object to extract love and validation from, the rapist exerts his control over her actions, attempting to manipulate the object into giving him what he needs. He denies her very humanity by exerting control over her actions without her free consent.

To the rapist, force is just a seduction technique that women ultimately want and enjoy. Rapists feed off and depend upon the pre-existing cultural narrative of women having no agency in their own sexuality and that “good” women don’t get raped, and so on. The entitled woman feels it’s okay to extort money and possessions from men, because that’s just the way love works. The rapist believes he deserves power over women, because that’s how he gets his needs met. Neither of these people will ever admit to this because, to them, it’s not a power play--it’s just how the world works. To the woman, her behavior is about having standards, respecting herself, and getting her needs met. To the rapist, his behavior is about getting laid and the external validation and approval he so closely ties to the sexual act. The rapist is trying to meet his own needs. To those on the outside, these are power moves rooted in entitlement. So... is rape really about sex or is it about power? It is about sex, but I would argue it is more about power. Just like the woman’s behavior is less about having standards and more about having power.

The problem with saying rape is about men wanting sex carries the subtext of “boys will be boys.” If rape is about getting laid, then we just need to teach women how to better say “no” and teach men how to not rape. The latter is possibly one of the most patronizing things I’ve ever heard. It’s accurate to say that rape is about sex—from the rapist’s point of view—but it also legitimizes the rapist’s point of view and reinforces a lot of damaging concepts surrounding women’s agency and sexuality (so much more on this, later). If it’s about sex, then women need to stop wearing such short skirts that give men ideas. It puts the onus of not getting raped on women, and makes women, in part, responsible for the choices and actions of men.

If the woman’s behavior is really about having high standards... then where have all the “real” men capable of meeting these standards gone? This isn’t about women being entitled—it’s about men being too lazy to meet basic standards! If rape is really about sex, then what we have here is women being too flamboyantly

sexy—what the hell was the rapist supposed to do with such temptation walking around? Women should cover up and stop putting themselves in situations where men's basic biological instincts are likely to come out!

When the subject is approached with the idea of "rape is about power," it's already assuming there are layers going on, because it's a sexual act and we're saying it's about something else. Just like when we approach certain women's ridiculous standards as "entitlement" versus "having high standards," we are already adding subtext that the woman's worldview isn't accurate. It's really not a problem of her standards being too high, it's a problem about her attitude and worldview. Framing it in this way allows for the subject to have this needed layer of nuance to fully understand what is truly going on. This is not about biology—it is about culture. We're talking about a mindset, not a genetic imperative. This is nurture, not nature.

When feminists say "rape is about power, not sex," this is what we are talking about.

Economics of Pussy and the Sexual Marketplace

Our only hope, our only peace, is to understand it, to understand the 'why'. 'Why' is what separates us from them, you from me. 'Why' is the only real source of power, without it you are powerless.

–Merovingian *Matrix Reloaded* (2003)

The sexual marketplace is the totality of people looking for sexual partners, be they short-term or long term. According to Red Pill, participants each have an objective sexual market value, or SMV, which is used to both set their own "price" in the marketplace and to use as currency to use with others in the marketplace. Sex, essentially, is used both as currency and product. Shoppers "win" when they are able to have sex with someone with a higher sexual market value than their own.

Virtually the whole of Red Pill's advice is centered on increasing a man's SMV so that he can attract higher SMV women. There is a belief that women are born with value and so must work to preserve their value, while men are born without value and so must create value. Red Pill supports this claim by referencing the idea that a woman's SMV peaks in her early twenties, while a man's SMV doesn't peak until his mid-thirties to early forties. Women, to preserve their initially high SMV, must work to maintain their beauty (what their desirability is based on) by maintaining a low body fat percentage, perfecting her grooming and physical presentation, and being humble or not becoming too entitled. Men, alternatively, are believed to have to build value over time. While there is a strong physicality aspect (having visible muscles and being fit), the primary focus in Red Pill is in economic and social accomplishment. Building material wealth and financial security takes time, and so Red Pill believes that men's SMV peaks in his thirties or early forties—old enough to have established himself in his career and social circle, but young enough to still have maintained a good physique.

There is also another critical component to Red Pill's model of how the sexual marketplace works, in that sex isn't just a currency and product but also a zero-sum power game. Men "gain" SMV by having sex and women "lose" SMV by having sex. Men with high bodycounts are higher-valued because they are desired by many women, and women with higher bodycounts are lower value because they, presumably, do not respect themselves and are "cheap." This is a

pretty critical aspect of Red Pill's ideology and the main one that gets Red Pill into a lot of trouble outside of its own community.

Women's SMV peaks in her early twenties, but men get more desirable as they get older. A man's SMV peaks in his late thirties or early forties.

We're going to go through this bit-by-bit. The part about women is easy—yes, every bit of data I've been able to find clearly shows that women in their early twenties are coveted by men of all ages more than any other age group of women.

OKCupid is one of the most popular online dating sites and today boats over 50 million users. In 2010, when OKCupid had 3.5 million users, they released a large amount of metadata on the behavioral patterns of their customers.

According to this data, woman's peak attractiveness is from 21-25, as judged by the number of initiating messages sent to them by men. One feature the dating site records is the stated age preferences of its users. Men will typically "cap" their preferences for women at roughly three-to-four years older than themselves, but their bias for younger women becomes more pronounced the older he gets. OKCupid's data shows that a typical 30-year-old man will state he is open to women up to nine years younger than himself, but a typical 42-year-old man will be interested in women up to fifteen years younger than himself.

Further skewing this preference is the issue that men's behavior does not match their stated preferences. That same 30-year-old man who said he wasn't interested in women younger than 21 will send just as many messages to 18-year-old women as he will to women his own age, and that 42-year-old man is still sending regular messages to 22-year-olds (OKCupid).

However, when it comes to men, their actual peak attractiveness seems to be between 25-30, rather than the much older range of 35-43 that I've seen consistently claimed by Red Pill. Men of all ages favor women between the ages of 21-25, but women consistently favor men within 5 years, plus or minus, of their own age. The only exception to this seems to be with young women 21-25 who are only interested in dating men no more than 5-6 older than themselves and whom are not interested in younger men (men still in school?). This causes a slight peak in men's number of received initiating messages when he is in the 25-30 age bracket. Past 25, both women's stated preferences and actual behavior show them interested in men with no more than a 5 year age difference, above or below, to herself.

One problem I've identified with Red Pill's sexual marketplace economics theories is that men define what makes a woman high-value, which is fine and perfectly logical… and then men seem to go ahead and define what makes a man high-value. These men then assume that what they define as the highest-value men will be able to secure the highest-value women.

This is one of those instances where Red Pill has taken a number of its own speculations as "fact" and "truth" and then concocted another whole layer of "fact" and "truth" on top of it. The only "evidence" any Red Pill advocate has been able to offer me to support this claim that women prefer men in their late thirties is the inductive reasoning that since women are attracted to men with resources and status who are still physically appealing, they must be most attracted to men in their late thirties.

Perhaps men 35-43 is when men find other men most valuable —usually advanced and confident in their careers but still young enough to maintain a decent physique and be physically strong and imposing. This idea plays to the male power fantasy. However, just because it's what men value in men doesn't automatically mean it's what women find most attractive in men. I find it very interesting that the "value" of men was assumed without consulting the "purchasers." When investigated, the actual shopping patterns of women do not reflect these men's assumed "high value" status.

22-year-old women, despite getting inundated with offers from men of all ages, spend the bulk of their time talking to men 22-24, and will almost never answer a message from a man over 32. Given that this is a pool of roughly 3.5 million independent users all acting independently in a free sexual marketplace, if men in their late thirties or early forties truly were the most attractive men… wouldn't women know about it?

One other possibility for origins of this fallacy of Red Pill's is the reality that men in their late thirties and early forties have an easier time in the dating market than women in their late thirties and early forties. This is also a result of men's high preference for women in their early twenties. Since women in their late thirties are only interested in men close to their own age, and men in their late thirties are interested in women close to their own age *and* in women much younger than them, men in their late thirties get more attention from women they are interested in than women in their late thirties get from men they are interested in. Ultimately, there are the same number of men and women in the dating market at any given time in any given age bracket, but since men's finite attention is more spread out and women's finite attention is more concentrated, the result is

that older men get more attention from women their own age than they give to women their own age.

From an individual's perspective, this can look to a man like he's suddenly peaked and look to a woman like she's suddenly hit a wall, but the truth is not so extreme. Men's SMV, at least when it comes to age, is directly relational to the age of the woman who is looking at him. However, since we do have a clear and set age for when women have the highest SMV (ages 21-25), we can use their preferences to determine what age men they are most interested in. According to the data, if a man wishes to have sex with the highest-value women in the marketplace, his best chance to do so is when he is between the ages of 22-30 (OKCupid).

High-value men, as defined by Red Pill, may very well be attractive to most women, and these high-value men may very well be concentrated between the ages of 35-42, but correlation does not equal causation. Men do not necessarily peak at 35-42 just because some tiny percentage of the men women find attractive happen to peak there. If there truly were some innate, biological tendency for women to be attracted to older, "peaked" men, then we would see a correlation in a 3.5 million person survey.

Clearly, we see this biological tendency in men's preferences, even when they lie to themselves about the kinds of women they are interested in, because there is a biological drive for them to seek a "peaked" level of attractiveness. We do not see anything similar in what women are finding attractive in men, and women are far more consistent in matching up their stated preferences vs. their actual behavior. Women consistently want men with no more than a 5-6 year age difference to themselves, younger or older, and "peaked" women want men their age or no more than 5-6 years older. The best chance a man will ever have to get with a "peaked" woman is when he is her age or no more than 5-6 years older than that peaked woman.

Red Pill will often throw out the claim that less than 1% of men will ever attain the "high value status" as Red Pill defines it, yet Red Pill consistently reassures all men that their best mating opportunities are ahead of them based on age alone.

I have not been able to find any data on the age demographics of the men most active in the Red Pill community, but based on my own limited conversations and surveys, Red Pill men seem to be mostly concentrated in their twenties. I find it both interesting and convenient that this myth of "future SMV peak-ness" is so hyped and preached as gospel in the Red Pill community. Most ideologies do have a "future reward" promised if only their followers remain faithful. It seems that Red Pill is no different.

According to the US Census Bureau, just over 76% of all marriages in the United States are to couples with no more than a five-year difference in age from each other. Only 7.6% of marriages are to couples where the husband is at least ten years older than the wife (CPS). Since it is obvious that the highest SMV women in their early twenties are getting plenty of offers from older men, the actual data seems to show that the theory that men's SMV peaks later in life is false.

Women have a biological clock, but men can father children well into old age. That's why women hit "the wall" at age 30 while older men are more desirable than younger men.

A woman's chance of conceiving within 12 months of actively trying to become pregnant (having unprotected sex at least three times per week) by her age are:

20-24 = 96%

25-34 = 86%

35-39 = 78%

40-44 = 10-20%

45+ = 3-4%

A woman's chance of passing on chromosomal defects (like Downs syndrome) also drastically increases with age. Compared to a 25-year-old woman, a woman at 35 has a 3-fold risk of conceiving a baby with chromosome anomalies and a 40-year-old woman a 12-fold risk (Habbema, J; Broekmans, FJ).

Even when adjusted for their partner's age (when these studies only look at men with significantly younger wives), men's chance of conception also drastically decreases with age and older fathers present their own unique risks to the baby. Compared to a father under 25, a father 35-39 years-of-age has a 3-fold chance of his partner suffering a miscarriage, and a father over 40 a 60% greater chance than a man 25-29. It will take a man over the age of 45 five times as long to impregnate his partner than if he was under 25 and his partner will have a 15% greater risk of preterm birth. While aging mothers risk chromosomal abnormalities, aging fathers risk sperm DNA fragmentation, which results in cognitive abnormalities, such as schizophrenia, autism, and psychosis. Compared to a father 20-24 years of age, a father at 36-years-old passes on twice as many mutations and has a 3.5-fold chance of having a baby with cognitive abnormalities. A father over 45 has a 13-fold chance of his child inheriting cognitive abnormalities (Harris, Isiah; Hassan, MA).

So, while men get a few more years of healthy fertility than

women, it still seems important for men to prioritize being done having kids by the time he is 40, and for a woman by the time she is 35. Both may have more difficulty in the five years prior to that, so when possible those numbers would be best set at early 30s for women and 35 for men, as women 35-39 still have a 4 out of 5 chance of getting pregnant while men over 35 have a 52% decrease in fertility versus men under 35.

Women do have the hard fertility-cutoff of menopause while men can *theoretically* father healthy children into old age, but in reality they are going to have difficulties being able to do so. Even then, these men would be taking risks with his unborn children similar to an older woman's risk of having children with chromosomal abnormalities, even if these men were able to secure a woman in her early twenties and at her peak fertility.

Given this data, it seems unlikely that women would evolve to have a preference for older men, and the behavioral pattern of women in mate selection seems to conclude that, as a whole, they do not have this preference.

Women want high-value men, and high-value men end up with high-value women. That's just basic economics.

To address this, we need to come up with some concrete definitions of what a "high-value man" and a "high-value woman" looks like according to Red Pill. For men, the definitions are reasonably consistent: he must earn a lot of money ($10,000+ per month being the gold standard); he must have visible and defined musculature and a low body fat percentage; he must be conventionally attractive and masculine in his face; he must be tall; he must be high on the social hierarchy (generally defined as hanging out with other high-value men and being accepted by them as such); he must be successful with women, generally defined by a high bodycount; and he ideally will be between the ages of 35-43—although this last point is seen more as a "peak" stage than an absolute requirement of a high-value man. To put that another way, a younger or older man can still be high-value, but all other things being equal, a man in the peaked age range will be higher value than a man younger or older than him.

For women, the standards are: she must be young, ideally between the ages of 21-25; she must be slim, physically fit, and have a low body fat percentage; she must be conventionally pretty in her face; she must be "feminine," which generally seems to translate into "submissive," "not a feminist," and favor traditional gender norms; she must have a very low bodycount. The last point inspires a great

deal of contention within the Red Pill community—a significant portion of Red Pill men believe a virgin is the highest-quality woman, while others disagree on a standard that strict and instead define a low bodycount as some arbitrary number, usually in the single digits, or a more general "does not participate in casual sex and only has sex within the confines of a committed, long-term relationship."

First, I will address who virgins tend to marry and the "cost" of this high-quality woman, then we will move on to not-necessarily virginal high-quality women.

It is well known and accepted that women who are virgins at marriage enjoy the lowest divorce rate of any other group of women. This is a big part of why so many Red Pill men put virginity on a pedestal. According to the most recent data from the National Survey of Family Growth, approximately 5% of married women in the U.S. had zero previous sexual partners at the time of her marriage. These women also enjoy the lowest risk of divorce, with roughly 6% of these marriages ending within 5 years (IFS). These numbers have declined since the 1980s when the same survey showed these marriages having an 11% divorce rate, and 17% of 1980s brides were virgins when they walked down the aisle.

So who are these high-value virgins today? Well, for one thing, 70% of them consider themselves "highly religious" and attend church weekly. This was only true of about 56% of them in 1980. I believe what we are seeing, and I think Red Pill would agree with me, is that as cultural attitudes towards premarital sex become more accepting, only the most religiously zealot women choose to delay sex until marriage. As such, their marriages are going to have (1) increased societal support and pressures to be maintained, and (2) increased societal stigma and pressures to not get divorced. I grew up in the church and feel I have some authority to speak here: I know several Christians who have been married for decades, but live apart because they hate each other. They won't divorce because "it's a sin." I would not call this a successful marriage, but statistically, it is.

Just to be clear, since a whopping 70% consider themselves "highly religious" it's a sure bet that 25-ish% are going to consider themselves at least "moderately religious." This is not a true/false situation where 70% are "highly religious" and 30% are "not at all religious." In today's world, there are remarkably few motivations for a woman to remain a virgin until marriage unless she holds significantly strong beliefs about remaining a virgin.

So, what will daily life with a high-value and religious woman look like? First off, they will be dragging the entire family to church every Sunday morning and likely Wednesday night.

For some Red Pill men, this is not a big deal, but for others who understand what that means, it can quickly become a deal breaker—Sunday church is not a 2-hour sermon, it is an all-day social event. You wake up, get dressed in very uncomfortable clothes, get to church early to chat and mingle, sit through the 2-hour service, linger afterwards to chat and gossip more, then all the different cliques meet at their respective restaurants for lunch. On the way home, the families generally all stop by the same grocery stores and linger and mingle even more. For those Red Pill men who enjoy relaxing after a hard week's work, they will find that part of the "price" of a virgin bride doesn't just include half their assets, but also half their weekend.

In addition, few Red Pill men would object to their daughters being taught chastity and modesty until marriage, but how many would allow their sons to be instructed to remain a virgin until his marriage? A highly religious mother will believe standard Red Pill "plate theory" teachings will corrupt her beloved son's soul and prevent him from entering paradise and she will fight tooth and nail against it. Any Red Pill man who manages to secure himself a high-value woman and who works to instruct his sons on Red Pill doctrine can expect a great deal of marital and social strife, since she will almost certainly consult the family's pastor and other God-fearing wives about how to handle the situation. Any Red Pill man who responds with "If she's really a high-value and submissive woman, then she will accept her husband's decision" is deluding himself. She worked very hard to be the sort of woman the man of her dreams would marry—and now that man is trying to send her beloved child to Hell.

Do virgins end up with what Red Pill defines as high-value men? While I don't have exact numbers for when virgins get married, I don't think it would be inaccurate to say that they tend to marry young, particularly when a lot of religion is mixed in. We've seen that these young women have plenty of offers from all ages and types of men vying for their attention, so it should be lady's choice.

One rather telling fact about our culture's patriarchal obsession with women's virginity and sexuality, but not men's, is that the surveys ask all sorts of questions of women about their sexual history before marriage, but fail to ask the same questions to the men. I was, frankly, shocked to discover this rather large blind spot in the data. Its absence begs for bias conclusions because without it it's easy to look at the available data and say, "hey! *Women's* bodycount before marriage means XYZ for her marital success rate!" with no way to check if *men's* bodycount before marriage has a similar or even opposite correlation. Do virgin men also enjoy lower rates of divorce?

Do men with 20+ partners who are presumably higher-value and more attractive to women have more stable marriages? I cannot answer these questions because the researchers never asked the men how many sexual partners they had before marriage. This is the same situation that Red Pill puts itself in when interpreting the 80/20 rule while not looking at it from the women's side of things—it leads to incomplete, biased, and ultimately inaccurate conclusions.

However, that is a rant for a different book. In order to explore this question as best as we can, we have to do a little digging into the data that we do have.

The *Relationships in America* report does ask men and women when sex first occurred in their current relationship. 12% of men said they first had sex with their current spouse after marriage. An important thing to keep in mind: this does not mean they waited until marriage to ever have sex, only that they did not have sex with their *current sexual partner* until marriage. Either he or she or both may have had sex with someone else before they married, but for whatever reason, the couple chose to abstain until marriage. This means that it is possible that a high-value Red Pill man with many past sexual conquests decided to settle down, found a good high-quality virgin, and waited for her. Since marrying a virgin kind of requires that you don't have sex with her until after you get married, we now have a pool of candidates to look at when seeing who those virginal high-quality women chose to tie the knot with.

Controlling for age and education and several other factors, we see that these men are characterized by several clear correlations, specifically: Regular attendance at religious services, political conservatism, higher self-rated happiness, higher age at first sex, holding more restrictive attitudes about sexual relationships, and parents who were still married.

While being Red Pill doesn't necessarily preclude also being highly religious, there are a number of difficult conflicts that a man must resolve between Red Pill's ideology and most of the larger religious doctrines in the USA. Having restrictive attitudes about sexual relationships also does not correlate with being a high-value Red Pill man whose high-value-ness is partially determined by how many women he's had sex with. It's not impossible, but it would be difficult for a man who is high value by Red Pill's definition to be in this 12%.

What else can we tell about these 12% of men that the 5% of virgins are selecting from? Well, 55% of these men report only one lifetime sexual partner. Since he also reported that he waited until marriage to have sex with his partner, it's safe to presume that his

wife is the only woman he's had sex with. That means that roughly 6.4% of men were virgins when they got married.

We can double-check our numbers with the women's data of 11% who waited until marriage to have sex with their current partner and the 54% of those who report only one lifetime partner to come up with 5.7% of women who were virgins at the time of their marriage. This matches nicely with the National Institute of Family Studies approximate 5% female virginity rate (IFS; Regnerus p.99).

While not conclusive, this does heavily suggest that young virgin women are choosing to marry virgin men who hold the same attitudes about sexual relationships and share similar religious values that the women do.

Is there anything else we can use to explore this question of if high-value Red Pill men ultimately end up with the promised high-value women? Why yes there is, and his name is Roosh Valizadeh.

For background, Roosh V. was one of the top leaders of the Red Pill and manosphere communities and one of the leading pick up artists (PUAs) in the world. He spent the better part of 15 years perfecting his approach to female psychology and writing a dozen or more Red Pill books instructing men on how to get more women into bed more quickly. I cannot emphasize enough how much influence and status this man had in the Red Pill community—when picking the top three influential names during the time, his would be one of them and his books, blogs, and podcasts helped shape what Red Pill is today. His most popular book was 2011's *Day Bang: How to Casually Pick Up Girls During the Day* that offered such first-hand wisdom as, "While I'm not saying you should hate women, my initial impression of them is that they're lubricated holes that exist mostly for a man's sexual pleasure."

In 2019, at age forty, Roosh renounced his former lifestyle and the actions of PUAs and converted to orthodox Christianity. He also, among other things, wrote the book *Lady*. While the bulk of the book focuses on instructing women how to catch a husband and avoid men like him, peppered throughout are tidbits of Roosh's own experiences and current struggles.

Before proceeding, let us establish if Roosh V. meets Red Pill's criteria for a high-value man. I am not privy to Roosh's bank statements, but a quick Google search puts his current net worth at around $1.5 million. He is not obese and from the photos I've seen from Google searches seems to be reasonably fit. I have no idea how tall he is, but I've yet to find a photo of him standing next to someone that wasn't shorter than him. I'd estimate he is, at a bare minimum, 5'10". He's certainly

attractive enough to have amassed a large bodycount and has been highly successful with women. He has widespread name recognition. He is within Red Pill's prime age range for men of 35-43. By every criteria Red Pill has for what constitutes a "high-value man," Roosh V. either meets it or comes awful close. He even meets our unicorn status of being highly religious and willing to wait for sex with his current partner until marriage (*Lady*, p.113), making him potentially within the 12% of men that high-quality virgin women select from.

Roosh V. is now in the market to find a wife and a mother to the children he desperately wants. When Roosh's sister died shortly before his reinvention of himself, she took with her the only meaningful relationship with a woman Roosh ever had, and the thought of being alone for the rest of his life scared the daylights out of him. At the time of publishing *Lady* (which he dedicated to his late sister) his PUA skills allow him to get dates with these high-value women he and other Red Pill men covet (21-25, beautiful, low bodycount, wanting to focus on building a family), but as soon as they found out about his promiscuous history and past hypocrisy towards women, those ideal wives and mothers went running. This isn't just my interpretation of his dating struggles, he said it with his own words: "While it's positive that you've learned from your past, you won't be able to escape it entirely. The more mistakes you've made, the more likely you will lose good men, just like how I've lost girls because of my public sexual history" (*Lady*, p.114).

One thing that stood out to me was the sorts of things he writes about learning in his recent actual relationships with women, such as how to resist the temptation of other women. Lessons that, frankly, I'd expect a man to learn with his high school sweetheart. But Roosh is now in his forties and is struggling with the concept of having to either drastically lower his standards (which he recommends women do in *Lady*) or join a monastery and make peace with being alone for the rest of his life. All he can do is seduce women that he doesn't want, and the hollowness of the life he's built for himself has led him into an existential crisis.

I checked back in on Roosh V.'s blog shortly before writing this chapter (a bit over two years after he published *Lady*) to see how he was doing. Sadly, after nearly three years of searching for the future mother of his children, he remains unmarried with no likely prospects. He does, however, offer some first-hand perspectives to answer the Red Pill assumption that men will be able to secure high-value woman later in life if they follow the teachings of Red Pill:

> If you destroy your sexual purity and later repent, that's enough for God, but will it be enough for a virgin partner to

> accept you as a spouse? Look at me as an example. What percentage of female Orthodox virgins with a proper upbringing would select me as a husband? Would their fathers allow me to marry their daughters? If I had a pure daughter, and she brings home a middle-aged man who went on a decades-long sex bender around the world, I would chain her up in the basement until she changed her mind, because while that man is a Christian now, I do not want to be anxious that he will simply go back to his old ways and harm my lovely daughter.
>
> Staying away from sex keeps you in the running for women who are doing the same, because I tell you that faithful young women have their pick of Christian men to choose from. If you've fallen hard in the world then you should be paired with someone who also fell hard. The excuse "There are no good women" should not be uttered by depraved masturbators and fornicators like myself who were anything but good for most of their adult lives. (Valizadeh, Roosh. 2021)

Roosh V. spent his youth believing in a sexual double standard that, as he is coming to learn, might not exist. This is literally one of Red Pill's experts in women's sexual psychology and he is unable to get the women he wants—the women that were promised to him by Red Pill. What worked well for him in the casual sex marketplace does not translate into the long-term relationship marketplace. He is learning that, ultimately, all he has are theories and no actual skills in how attract and participate in a long-term relationship. The high-value women he always assumed would be there when he was ready to settle down are rejecting him for spending his life not being the sort of man who valued settling down. He has paid dearly for this wisdom that women with certain values about sexual relationships tend to select men who share those same values. I applaud Roosh V. for his humility and courage to share this hard-earned wisdom with others. I also applaud him for sacrificing guaranteed success within his former community in order to stand by his integrity and convictions—not long after he stopped promoting Red Pill's ideology, he unpublished the dozen or more books that had made him a rich and influential man. His journey has been a painful and humbling one, and I wish him the best in one day finding his happily-ever-after.

If men wish to eventually settle down and raise a family with a wife who has conservative beliefs about sex and a bodycount to match, those men would be wise to not only value those things in women, but to possess those same things themselves. Ultimately, the

"price" of a top-shelf high-value woman is to meet her definition of what a "high-value man" is.

What about non-virgins with low bodycounts? Interestingly, while virgins do have the lowest divorce rates, historically the statistics tell us that the highest risk for divorce is actually when the wife had 2 previous sexual partners, and that this risk goes down significantly with 3-9 previous sexual partners. It's only at 10+ previous sexual partners, and even then only in recent years, that the risk for divorce goes above the risk level of 2 previous partners. In previous years, that spike at 10+ wasn't seen (IFS).

If Red Pill is correct, then there should be a gradual increase in the risk of divorce that correlates with a higher number of sexual partners prior to marriage. The whole point of valuing women with low bodycounts is because they are less likely to cheat on their men or leave their men. However, this is not the pattern that emerges—quite consistently, we see a spike a 2 previous sexual partners, then a dip at 3 partners, another dip at 4-5 partners, until finally leveling out at a 20% risk with 6-9 and onto 10+ previous sexual partners. It is only in the most recent data that a spike in divorce rate at 10+ partners is seen, and it will be interesting to see if this trend holds in the next round of surveys or if it is a statistical anomaly, like what we saw in the male sexlessness data.

If it does hold, my theory is that we are dealing with the influence of social media. Social media has a way of "keeping exes around," so to say, to an extent that would be impossible without a woman actively and verbally comparing her partner to those exes (which is just bad manners).

While most adults can intellectually understand that their partner had a past before them, no one enjoys having it thrown in their face again and again. Social media, through it's 'this is what you did on this day five years ago!' features and the inevitability of sharing friends in similar social circles posting group photos, and on and on, could have a negative effect on the stability of the relationship through these regular reminders. It would also make sense that the women with greater numbers of previous sexual partners would have more frequent reminders and so greater risk of divorce. This is pure speculation on my part, which is why it will be interesting to see if this blip is just a fluke or if it persists in future surveys.

Why do women with only two previous sexual partners have the highest divorce rates? I have no idea. But if we're looking to find what kind of woman has the lowest divorce risk, then that is a question the data can help us with. If what we are looking for is a statistically low risk of divorce for factors besides virginity, then our

ideal woman will have these characteristics:

- She will have never married before. It is common knowledge that the overall divorce rate in the USA hovers roughly around 50%, but that's for all marriages. First marriages enjoy a lower risk of 41% (this only holds if it is also the husband's first marriage). Second marriages end in divorce 60% of the time and third marriages 73% of the time (Branschick, Mark).

- She will be childless. The presence of children from previous relationships, either from the man or woman, increases the risk that a marriage will end in divorce (White, L.K). Getting accurate statistics for this has been difficult. I have seen numerous quotes from "a recent study" citing that second marriages where both partners bring in stepchildren raise the risk of divorce from 60% to 70%, however, none of the articles I found referenced an actual study. For this reason, it is impossible for me to accurately determine *how* negative a factor a child from a previous relationship is to a future marriage. I can only say that it is a disrupting factor. Interestingly, while any child born within the marriage offered a stabilizing effect, even a child fathered by the future husband, but born out of wedlock, had a similar disruption rate to the marriage as a step-child born from a previous relationship (Waite, Linda J).

- She will have parents who are still married. For what is likely a complex and perfect storm of reasons, including not having a healthy relationship modeled for her and lack of witnessing effective conflict resolution techniques, if a woman's parents divorced she is 69% more likely to divorce herself. If she marries a man whose parents also divorced, the couple's risk of divorce goes up 189% (Amato, P.R.)

- She will be in her late-twenties-to-early-thirties. Until age 32, every year delaying marriage decreases risk of divorce by an average of 11%, while every year delay after age 32 increases risk by about 5%. Women who waited until they were between the ages of 25-34 before marrying enjoyed the lowest risk of divorcing within 5 years—only 14-15% (IFS).

- She will have a college degree. This, along with it being a first marriage, are possibly the most significant factors in determining statistical likelihood of divorce. A woman with a high school diploma or less has a 40% chance of her first marriage lasting at least 20 years. A woman with at least a bachelor's degree has a 78% chance of her first marriage lasting at least 20 years (Wang, Wendy).

- She will be the same age as her husband-to-be. Compared to couples born within 12 months of each other, even a 1-year difference in age increases the risk of divorce by 3%. A 5-year difference brings with it an 18% increase in divorce risk and a 10-year age gap a 39% increase in risk (Bailey, Martha J et. al.). The direction of the age gap is also significant—for every year in age difference, the older spouse is less likely to initiate divorce and the younger spouse is more likely. For men married to women at least three years older than himself, his odds of initiating divorce go up by 87% while her odds of initiating divorce decrease by 23%. When you reverse the genders and the husband is at least three years older than his wife, his risk of initiating divorce decreases by 50% and her risk goes up 38% (Lee, Wang-Sheng).

- She will have had between three and nine sexual partners before her husband. As discussed before, this upper limit may or may not be statistically significant (IFS)

So while roughly 50% of all marriages in the USA end in divorce, by simply selecting for women in their late twenties or very early thirties who have also earned a college degree and have never married before, a man can decrease his risk of divorce to 20%, or one-in-five. That's a four-out-of-five chance that the marriage will be successful based on the three most influential characteristics alone. Red Pill's advice that if men have to marry, they should wait until at least age thirty-five and then marry a woman in her early twenties is not based on any actual data. It's based entirely on Red Pill taking its own assumptions at face value and then extrapolating what the likely outcomes would be if those assumptions were true. Red Pill assumes that women are attracted to significantly older men, so Red Pill assumes that those are the most stable marriages. Red Pill assumes that higher education indoctrinates women into a feminist mindset (and assumes that feminism is bad for marriages) and so assumes that college-educated women have a higher divorce rate. Red Pill assumes

that women with higher bodycounts are more likely to cheat on their partners, and so assumes that women with lower bodycounts are less likely to divorce. None of these assumptions are in any way based on actual scientific data.

Studies show that women can't pair bond after too high a bodycount.

I can't tell you how often this "fact" is brought up in the Red Pill community. It's nearly impossible to get through a conversation or topic without it coming up. Again and again, it would be insisted to me that studies had proven this to be a thing, and again and again, no one could provide me with any clue as to where the study came from. It took months for me to track this one down, and months more for me to map the rabbit hole.

The beginning of the journey to find this claim comes from a 2008 book entitled *Hooked: New Science on how Casual Sex is affecting our Children* written by Joe McIlhaney Jr. and Freda Bush.

For background, Joe McIlhaney is a medical doctor and religiously motivated abstinence advocate who served as President Bush's health adviser when he was the governor of Texas. In 2001, President Bush appointed him to the Presidential Advisory Council on HIV/AIDS, where Freda Bush joined him in 2006.

McIlhaney's appointment was controversial because of his strong religious beliefs and anti-condom philosophies, along with his complete lack of any published, peer-reviewed research or endorsement by any established medical societies. He was seen by many as being more ideological than scientific and criticized for regularly withholding or twisting scientific data to fit his ideological narrative. One of the 2004 textbooks used to teach reproductive health in public schools was "polished" by McIlhaney prior to publication in order to appeal to the administration's abstinence-only sentiment rather than legal educational requirements. The textbook completely lacked the words "contraception" and "condom," and taught public school students that all people, even adults, should avoid sexual activity until they are married. Additional materials compare a woman who is not a virgin to a dirty shoe and suggested that men are unable to stop themselves from assaulting a woman once they become sexually aroused (Quinn, Dan). The textbook caused a lawsuit, which alleged that it failed to provide students with the legally required minimum instruction of medically accurate, comprehensive information about HIV prevention, STD contraction, and FDA-approved methods for preventing pregnancy (Kempner, Martha).

In *Hooked*, the authors use a basis of women having more oxytocin and men having more vasopressin as a basis for their claims that premarital sex is damaging to both men and women… but mostly to women. Oxytocin is a hormone important for things like uterine contractions in childbirth and breastmilk flow during lactation. It's also involved with many important social functions and is associated with trust, empathy, and social bonding. Oxytocin is released during activities like cuddling, sex, orgasm, childbirth, and eating chili peppers. *Hooked* repeatedly makes the point that women must be protected from themselves and from the dangers of her own body:

> Oxytocin can cause a woman to bond to a man even during what was expected to be a short-term sexual relationship. She may know he is not the man she would want to marry but intimate sexual involvement causes her to be so attached to him that she can't make herself separate. This can lead to a woman being taken off-guard by a desire to stay with a man she would otherwise find undesirable and staying with him even if he is possessive or abusive (p.38).
>
> A woman's brain can cause her to be blindsided by a bad relationship that she thought was good because of the physical contact and the oxytocin response it generates. The truth about such a relationship may be apparent to parents or friends who are concerned about the girl's well-being, but it takes wisdom and tact to effectively warn a young woman about a relationship others can see could be dangerous to her (p.40) … they [women] cannot know that they actually are seriously damaging a bonding mechanism that they are born with, a mechanism put there to allow them to, in the future, have a healthy bonded marriage that is a stable relationship and provides a healthy nest for children that might be conceived and born into their home (p.41).

In fact, *Hooked* claims that the mechanism of oxytocin in women is so powerfully driven to create romantic bonds that women should avoid hugging men, lest they flip the switch:

> There is a warning here for parents and young people, particularly young women. If a young woman becomes physically close to and hugs a man, it will trigger the bonding process, creating a greater desire to be near him and, most significantly, place greater trust in him. Then, if he wants to escalate the physical nature of the relationship, it will become harder and harder for her to say no (p.39).

The central thesis of *Hooked* is that humans are designed to be punished when our sexual behavior falls outside of hetero-Christian

ideals; *Hooked* claims that premarital sex causes women's brains to develop a tolerance to oxytocin and so a lessening of its effects with greater use: "Their inability to bond after multiple liaisons is almost like tape that loses its stickiness after being applied and removed multiple times" (p.43).

The only reference in *Hooked* to back up this rather interesting claim is from a study linking virginity before marriage to lower divorce rates using data from the *National Survey of Family Growth*, which we have already discussed in detail (Kahn, Joan R.). *Hooked* is, at best, confusing correlation with causation here when it infers that it's because the woman had sex before marriage that causes a high divorce rate, rather than the more generally accepted reasoning that women who hold certain high values and priorities about commitment and marriage choose to stay virgins until marriage.

Regardless, the internet is a powerful tool and I wanted to know where *Hooked* was getting its ideas from. The interesting tape analogy itself leads us to Dr. Erik Keroack:

> Extrapolating in part from research with prairie voles, which are monogamous, he postulates that oxytocin cannot survive too much sex, at least with multiple partners, at least prior to marriage. By way of demonstration he proposes the duct tape test: you need only an adhesive and a hairy arm. The tape represents the brain. Press it down. Now reapply. See what happens? Less sticky, right? Concludes Keroack: "Basically, you will end up damaging your brain's ability to use the oxytocin system as a chemical mechanism that serves to help you successfully bond in future relationships" (Schiff, Stacey).

Once I found Keroack, things started falling into place. For background, Keroack is another anti-condom, pro-abstinence idealist who was an even more controversial figure than McIlhaney. Keroack was the Medical Director of "A Woman's Concern," a Christian nonprofit in Massachusetts that ran numerous crisis pregnancy centers which did not offer contraception and primarily worked to "educate and empower women to make healthy, life-affirming decisions regarding their pregnancies and sexual health" (A Woman's Choice).

In 2006, President Bush appointed him to Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs at the Department of Health and Human Services. I had to do some Googling to translate that, but Keroack's position was a higher-level managerial role within the department, which is the organization that manages the Administration for Children and Families, which is the division of the government responsible for mandating abstinence-only education. The Department of Health and Human Services is advised directly by the

Presidential Advisory Committee on HIV/AIDS, which both McIlhaney and Freda Bush were on during Keroack's term. I have no direct references, but I don't think it's unreasonable to assume that McIlhaney and Freda Bush would make themselves familiar with Keroack's work at the time of Keroack's appointment.

It is important to point out that the departments responsible for pushing the abstinence-only agenda were doing so out of ideology rather than scientific credibility. These appointments did not have to be vetted or approved by anyone other than the President, and even the government's own internal investigations office found the department held no standard for factual accuracy: "the GAO [Government Accountability Office] found that ACF [Administration for Children and Families] does not review abstinence grantees' educational materials for scientific accuracy and does not require either CBAE [Community-Based Abstinence Education] or Title V programs to review their own materials for scientific accuracy" (Ott, Mary A).

It should not be surprising, then, that these appointments favor individuals who do not value a rigorous scientific standard and who are prone to making leaps of logic to fit an agenda. In a 2006 PowerPoint presentation at the Human Life Alliance, Keroack referenced a study which examined the levels of oxytocin present during both positive and negative memories, then leapt to this conclusion:

> In my clinical experience as an OB/GYN, the concept of "SELECTIVE AMNESIA" needs absolutely no formal studying in order for it to be believed …THE FACT THAT WOMEN EVEN CONSIDER GOING THROUGH CHILD-BIRTH MORE THAN ONCE…IS "ROCK-SOLID" EVIDENCE of "SELECTIVE AMNESIA" caused by OXYTOCIN !!! (Slide #7, emphasis is original).

In 2007, Keroack resigned from his position at the Department of Health and Human Services after he "received two formal warnings from the Massachusetts board of medicine ordering him to refrain from prescribing drugs to people who are not his patients and from providing mental health counseling without proper training" (Estes, Andrea).

This repeated claim by Red Pill originates not from a study, but from a 2001 paper Keroack co-wrote with Dr. John Diggs for the Abstinence Clearinghouse, a group dedicated to promoting purity and sexual abstinence. In that paper, Keroack claims that "People who have misused their sexual faculty and become bonded to multiple persons will diminish the power of oxytocin to maintain a permanent

bond with an individual. . . . Just as in heroin addiction . . . the person involved will experience 'sex withdrawal' and will need to move on to a . . . new sex playmate." When a woman repeatedly forms and breaks bonds created by oxytocin, the resultant "lack of the oxytocin can lead to sexual infidelity and addiction" (Keroack, 2001).

Now that we finally have a source, we can proceed to investigate it.

The sole reference given for this claim is a preliminary study published in the peer-reviewed journal *Psychiatry: Interpersonal and Biological Processes* in 1999 by Dr. Rebecca Turner. The study looked at the oxytocin levels of women as they were instructed to recall both positive and negative memories. The study had nothing to do with fidelity, pair bonding, or sex addiction (Turner, Rebecca). When Turner discovered that her work was being used to give credibility to this claim, she denounced Keroach's conclusions as "complete pseudoscience" and stated:

> We all know that strong belief systems do influence the interpretation of any facts. That is why, in science, we put forth our work for critical review by our peers… In any case, none of our studies provide a basis for their claims. Most people are not going to go to the original scientific sources (the journals) to see whether the claims of politicians are correct. That's why it is so easy to mislead the public with interpretations of scientific findings.
>
> Our research examined whether blood levels of oxytocin would similarly increase with sad or positive emotions induced by interview discussions and emotionally-evocative film clips. The research was a collaboration between CSPP and the University of California San Francisco (UCSF), and was funded by the National Institutes of Mental Health in 1998. Margaret Altemus, MD, a psychiatrist at the Weill Medical College of Cornell University, was Co-Principal Investigator for the studies. The initial study was cutting-edge research at the time; but, in the end (2002), we did not find changes in oxytocin levels that were related to these emotions…
>
> At least Dr. Keroack's co-author did acknowledge that they were developing conclusions that no scientists would ever put forth. (AIU)

Furthermore, this claim that women cannot pair bond after multiple sexual partners due to an oxytocin tolerance just doesn't make sense. Oxytocin does not just elevate during romantic and/or sexual and reproductive relationships, as *Hooked* claims (p.35), but in

all social bonding relationships, even when bonding with animals, and in many activities that are simply pleasurable such as stretching or taking a hot shower. And while the theory of developing a tolerance to a hormone over times makes a sort of logic, since that is how it works with outside chemicals, it's simply not how we are designed to work with our own body's natural chemistry. One of the most significant oxytocin released a woman can experience is during childbirth and labor, and it is believed that oxytocin is important in bonding a woman to her newborn child. If women's bodies were designed to develop tolerances to oxytocin with usage, then we would expect women to bond less with their third and fourth children and be less attuned to their needs than she was with her first child. This is not a phenomenon we see, and it's not something we would intuitively expect to evolve in a sexually reproducing species. Comparing a body's naturally produced hormone to heroin is just… absurd.

If we were designed to become less sensitive to oxytocin's bonding ability over time and with use, then we would expect to bond with each subsequent pet less. We would expect to bond with each subsequent friend less, and, contrary to *Hooked* and Keroack's claims, we would expect monogamous couples to become less and less bonded over the decades.

The claim that oxytocin does not affect male pair bonding in the same way because of a higher level of vasopressin is also not supported by the data *Hooked* references. Vasopressin is a bonding hormone, but much like oxytocin, its role is a lot more multifaceted and nuanced and dependent on circumstance than just "it bonds people." Vasopressin regulates fluid concentrations in the body and plays a role in blood pressure. It also plays a mediating part in complex social behaviors; specifically, vasopressin seems to facilitate high-risk, but high-reward, cooperative behavior (Brunnlieb, Claudia et al.). Things like group hunting of large and dangerous game animals poses high levels of personal risk, but also the potential for high levels of reward. Both men and women possess vasopressin and oxytocin and use both to form bonds, as evidenced by men in long-term monogamous relationships who do show higher levels of oxytocin compared to men who favor a non-monogamous social strategy (Ophir, A. G). So what is good for the goose should be good for the gander and if Red Pill and *Hooked* and Keroach are correct and premarital sex leads to damaging the pair-bonding mechanisms in the brain, then it would be just as mentally and emotionally dangerous for men to engage in premarital sex as it is for women. Interestingly enough, even *Hooked* comes to this conclusion, although somehow Red Pill managed to miss that part:

> They do not realize that this pattern of having sex with one woman and then breaking up and then having sex with another woman limits them to experience only one form of brain activity common to humans involved sexually—the dopamine rush of sex. They risk damaging a vital, innate ability to develop the long-term emotional attachment that results from sex with the same person over and over. This transition can be seen in the brain studies of individuals who have been involved with each other for a period of months. The individual who goes from sex partner to sex partner is causing his or her brain to mold and gel so that it eventually begins accepting that sexual pattern as normal. For most people this brain pattern seems to interfere with the development of the neurological circuits necessary for the long-term relationships that for most people result in stable marriages and family development. The pattern of changing sex partners therefore seems to damage their ability to bond in a committed relationship (p.43).

All the references used to support *Hooked*'s conclusion that "vasopressin seems to be the primary cause of men attaching to women with whom they have close and intimate physical contact" (p.41) come from what the text claims is a small series of studies done on prairie voles. However, when I look in the back of the book for the references themselves, the notes all point to a paper entitled "Preoccupations and Behaviors Associated with Romantic and Parental Love: Perspectives on the Origin of Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder" published in *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinic of North America*. I've been unable to track down this paper in its entirety, but from the abstract it's pretty clear that it has nothing to do with prairie voles. If it does mention prairie voles, it's going to be referencing other studies that actually concentrate on prairie voles and will not offer any data on prairie voles itself. The book literally offers nothing to back up this rather important claim.

Now—prairie voles were a bit of a hot topic in the scientific community around this time, but I admit I'm a bit stunned at the omission. It's likely an editing error. However, since the central premise of this chapter seems to be based on Keroack's work, I can see that he based a lot of his conclusions on studies that compare what he calls "highly promiscuous" mountain voles to "highly monogamous" prairie voles (Keroack, 2006 slides 18-25). After reading far more scientific research about the neurobiology of prairie voles and mountain voles than I ever cared to know, I believe I have located the studies both *Hooked* and Keroack intended to reference (Insel TR; Williams JR; Young, LJ, 1999).

I believe I have also identified the problem: Both *Hooked* and Keroack hold these prairie voles up as paragons of monogamy and fidelity and claim that their elevated levels of male vasopressin and female oxytocin are the reasons why they are so loyal to each other. However, while all mammals possess both vasopressin and oxytocin, no species exhibits perfect sexual monogamy and only 3-5% exhibit what biologists call “social monogamy,” which is when a mated pair work together to raise children but still sneak off for casual sexual encounters on the side (National Science Foundation; Carter, Sue). Biologists make distinctions between “monogamy” and “sexual fidelity,” although in common speech we usually associate one with the other. When biologists refer to a species as “monogamous,” they are referring to a social pair-bonding behavior, not a sexual exclusivity.

Prairie voles are not, nor were they believed to be at the time *Hooked* and Keroack referenced them, sexually monogamous creatures. Females regularly carry mixed-paternity litters and mated males have been recorded having trysts with neighbors (Young LJ, 2003). These rodent’s elevated levels of bonding hormones have not kept them from straying from hetero-Christian sexual ideals, nor have those extramarital sexual relationships prevented them from successfully pair-bonding with their chosen mates. Furthermore, these studies recognize that pair-bonding is a complex process and only suggest that their findings indicate that oxytocin “may be one factor contributing to the development of partner preferences in this monogamous rodent” (Williams JR), whereas both *Hooked* and Keroack conclude that oxytocin and vasopressin are the end-all-be-all “monogamy molecule” or emotional “super-glue” that prove we are all supposed to remain virgins until our wedding night (McIlhaney p.41; Keroack, 2006 slide 1).

This isn’t the only blatant misrepresentation of scientific data *Hooked* is guilty of. Starting in Chapter One, the book sets out its core theme that sex outside of marriage is damaging: "The study showed that both boys and girls who have had sex are three times more likely to be depressed than their friends who are still virgins. The study accounted for other factors in the lives of the young people, ensuring an accurate comparison with their peers. The girls who became sexually active were three times more likely to have attempted suicide as their virgin friends, while the sexually active boys were fully seven times more likely to have attempted suicide" (p.20). The studies referenced, however, are specifically showing that depressed people are more likely to engage in all manors of risky behavior, not that premarital sex leads to depression. Both Keroack and *Hooked* show a pattern of disregarding scientific integrity in favor of personal

ideology and then claiming scientific credibility when they misrepresent scientific data. No wonder Red Pill loves these guys!

Dr. Jill Schneider, a behavioral neurologist, sums this drama up well:

> He [Keroack] has the results of the animal studies somewhat garbled. He's spreading misinformation about the studies themselves. Then, his extrapolation to humans is also unfounded. Keroack is using something he learned about oxytocin and bonding, and fabricating a story that somehow premarital sex would release oxytocin and prevent a woman's ability to form a long-term pair bond in marriage.
>
> It's basically medical misinformation to say that the only healthy human relationship is monogamous marriage. Clearly, there are healthy single people and healthy people who practice serial monogamy. The United States is full of all types of healthy families.
>
> For example, oxytocin is released during childbirth and breastfeeding and orgasm. If a mother experiences this great oxytocin release with her first child, there's no evidence that it would cause her to bond exclusively with that child. She certainly has the ability to welcome the next child and the next one. So, why would this guy think that oxytocin going up during premarital sex would prevent a healthy pair bond during marriage?
>
> … adoptive mothers are excellent mothers. They don't nurse or give birth to those children, so they don't have these big releases of oxytocin. Even juvenile humans can be extremely maternal. Boys can be nurturing, and dads can take very good care of their offspring. There have to be other mechanisms in mothering…
>
> He is projecting his own religious point of view onto a variety of data that comes from animal models. It's a matter of looking at these hormones and receptors objectively versus adding a lot of your own political and religious baggage to what you see.
>
> All behavioral biologists try to avoid this, because it clouds their own point of view about the animal they're studying. Once you have a lot of scientific data, you can use them to form political decisions, for example, using data about climate change to inform political decisions about global warming. Keroack has done the opposite; he used his agenda to create

so-called knowledge about oxytocin (Kutchinskas, Susan).

The claim that women cannot pair bond after having too many previous sexual partners is not supported by the scientific community at large, by the data referenced by those making the claim, or by the producers of the original research the claim is based on.

Studies have shown that women can retain DNA from guys she's had sex with in the past, so unless she's a virgin you might still get cucked and the baby might not be yours. / Studies have shown that women can retain DNA from guys she's had sex with in the past, so promiscuous women get more aggressive and masculine and unattractive the higher their bodycount goes.

This one has been debunked many times over, but I still see it with some regularity within the Red Pill community, so I will address it briefly.

In 2012, a study was published in which researchers were looking for male DNA within deceased women's brains in order to learn if male microchimerisms had any neurological consequences or benefits. A microchimerism occurs when a stem cell (a cell that can become any kind of cell—neural, muscular, skeletal, etc.) from an embryo is transferred from the fetus to the mother and utilized by the mother's body. Stem cells are found in embryos—once a fetus is sufficiently developed, then the differentially 'labeled' cells can only divide and become those same sorts of cells, be they muscle cells or brain cells or skin cells. Adults do have a more limited version of stem cells, but in small numbers and only in certain tissues, such as bone marrow.

Researchers already knew this phenomenon occurred because of earlier studies in female mice and they were curious of its implications in humans. The researchers fully expected to find male microchimerisms in humans, but this was the first study to officially discover them. This transfer of stem cells to the mother from the embryo occurs in all pregnancies, but it's much easier to find a male Y chromosome amongst a sea of the mother's XX chromosomes than it is to test each cell to discover if that particular XX came from a daughter.

Women with and without Alzheimer's disease were studied to see if there were any differences in the concentration of these male microchimerisms in regions of the brain that were affected by the disease. The fact that male DNA was found in human women was not at all surprising. What was surprising was how frequently they were found:

> In this study, we provide the first description of male Mc [microchimerisms] in female human brain and specific brain regions. Collectively with data showing the presence of male DNA in the cerebrospinal fluid, our results indicate that fetal DNA and likely cells can cross the human blood-brain barrier (BBB) and reside in the brain. Changes in BBB permeability occur during pregnancy and may therefore provide a unique opportunity for the establishment of Mc in the brain. Also unique to our study are the findings that male Mc in the human female brain is relatively frequent (positive in 63% of subjects) and distributed in multiple brain regions, and is potentially persistent across the human lifespan (the oldest female in whom male DNA was detected in the brain was 94 years)…
>
> The most likely source of male Mc in female brain is acquisition of fetal Mc from pregnancy with a male fetus. In women without sons, male DNA can also be acquired from an abortion or a miscarriage. The pregnancy history was unknown for all but a few subjects in the current studies, thus male Mc in female brain could not be evaluated according to specific prior pregnancy history. In addition to prior pregnancies, male Mc could be acquired by a female from a recognized or vanished male twin, older male sibling, or through non-irradiated blood transfusion (Chan WFN).

You will notice that "absorbed sperm DNA from sexual partners" is not on that list, because it is impossible for a sperm cell to transform itself into a neural cell. Also, if women did retain sperm DNA within her body, we would expect that sperm DNA to show up in more than 63% of deceased women, unless the researchers happened to only be examining the brains of deceased nuns.

What is happening here is that mother and child are sharing cells back and forth, and the mother is utilizing some of the fetus' stem cells to repair and fortify areas of her body that need it. While this study was small and more research is needed, their findings do suggest that these fetal stem cells offer women some measure of protection against developing Alzheimer's disease later in life. In women not known to have birthed a son, the presence of male microchimerisms is easily explained with a miscarriage of a male embryo. In a study of over 600,000 women in Denmark covering over one million confirmed pregnancies, the overall miscarriage rate was found to be 13.5% (Nybo Andersen, A M et al.)

Considering that the vast majority of miscarriages (roughly 80%) occur within the first few weeks of pregnancy (before many

women even realize they are pregnant), our best estimate for a true miscarriage rate is that approximately 26% of all pregnancies result in loss (Dugas, Carla).

In addition, as ultrasound technology becomes more and more advanced, we are finding that more and more singleton pregnancies were originally conceived as twin pregnancies. Roughly half of all pregnancies that are conceived with three or more embryos and 36% of pregnancies that begin with two embryos end up suffering from "vanishing twin syndrome" (Zamani Z). These are pregnancies that come to term, but with fewer babies than were originally conceived.

The resultant articles, claims, and Red Pill conclusions were nothing more than clickbait fueled by people with severely underdeveloped reading comprehension skills.

Men must create value, while women must preserve value.

There is a lot to unpack here, and so we are going to have to go through a few things before we can fully address this. First, I want to acknowledge an often overlook aspect of Red Pill which is really quite positive—these men want, so much, to please women. They're willing to do so much and work so hard to become the thing they believe women want. The standard comeback I hear for this (usually from Red Pill men) is that men are just trying to get laid and fulfil their own Spray-and-Pray sexual strategy, but I don't buy it for a second.

The systematic way Red Pill lays out to men as how to go about "fulfilling their own sexual strategy" requires a tremendous amount of work to increase their "value" and sometimes involves attempts to rewrite their very personalities into something more appealing to women. These are things like regular gym workouts, weight loss, job changes and/or promotions, investing, large material acquisitions such as cars, wardrobe changes, making himself his own "mental point of origin," becoming more confident in social situations, earning social, professional, and educational credentials, learning evolutionary mating strategy theories, adopting more "alpha" characteristics, and more. Increasing their "value" in this way takes years of work, dedication, and consistency. Yet, it's only on the very extreme fringes of MGTOW that some start coming to the obvious conclusion that hiring prostitutes involves a lower cost, much less time investment, and is allover a much simpler endeavor than what Red Pill prescribes.

Red Pill spends a lot of time spouting that women shouldn't be judged on what they say and should instead be judged based on their behavior. I think that's pretty good advice, so I'm going to apply it to

men. If physical release were primarily what Red Pill men were chasing, they could find it at a much lower cost than the acceptance they are working so hard to buy.

Many men, particularly young men, believe they just want lots and lots of sex. This is what I tend to call a "starving man" situation, where a man on the brink of starvation will fantasize about eating an entire cow in one sitting. Obviously, this would kill him, but his current circumstances of not getting enough sex to fill his needs dominates his thoughts to the point that he often isn't even aware of the contradictions of his own actions.

The reason why men are willing to spend so much time and energy to "earn" women wanting to have sex with them rather than pay for a prostitute to have sex with them is the same reason men are willing to pay thousands of dollars on sites like OnlyFans when there is a virtually unlimited amount of pornography available for free on the internet. OnlyFans women will respond—they will talk with the men, ask them questions, give recognition, imitate intimacy, and offer men guaranteed acceptance. Pornography does not alleviate loneliness—OnlyFans does.

Red Pill men are not looking for sex, they are looking for acceptance. These men may not be ready for commitment, but they are seeking love and safety with their sex. The physical drive may be primary in their minds, but their actions betray deeper needs. Even more than they want sex, men want to be wanted. This is what is called an emotional need, and it is the core of men's greatest insecurity and the crux of how Red Pill's ideology traps men into their own self-fulfilling hellish prophecy.

Most of the Red Pill men I've met found Red Pill after a particularly bad experience with women. Occasionally I encountered men who found it as a path to generalized self-improvement, but the majority of men who are in the community are there because of some sort of trauma—maybe it was a breakup, a divorce, a betrayal, or even just an extended time of being rejected by women. This is legitimate trauma and is something that needs to be worked through.

Red Pill, for many men, acts as a kind of therapy. It allows these men to go from being "victims" to being "survivors" and even "advocates"—to becoming someone who helps other men avoid the trauma they experienced. This is an exceptionally powerful thing, and not one I intend to minimize. The emotional journey Red Pill offers is real, and it is valuable, but it is also a trap.

Being a "survivor" or an "advocate" are both much healthier places to be, mentally speaking, than being a "victim." Red Pill does

good work in this regard—however, these men are still defining themselves by their trauma. By convincing men that all they can ever have with women is a transactional relationship, Red Pill prevents men from moving on even further to a place where their trauma no longer defines them. Trauma will always be a part of a survivor's past, but true healing comes when that survivor has moved on to a point where they have a life and people in it and relationships which are independent of that trauma. The very ideology of Red Pill precludes this final stage of healing.

There are many different types of "value" that Red Pill instructs men to pay attention to: sexual value, which is things like physical attractiveness and height; social value, which is things like connections and contacts; mating value, or willingness to invest in children; economic value, which is income, net value, and the corresponding indicators of high economic status like expensive vehicles; fitness value, which is generally things like muscles and endurance; and entertainment value, which are things like humor, ability to maintain a conversation, and social confidence. Red Pill lumps all this and probably more into SMV, or Sexual Market Value, and offers a systematic way to increase this SMV through both hard work and cheats or hacks. Before the days of Red Pill, "raising SMV" was called "building character."

Traditional gender norms have always had a component of transaction built into them—men provide provisioning and physical security, women provide sex and fertility. These were things the other needed but could not attain on their own. A transactional relationship is not necessarily unhealthy. It can be healthy, so long as both understand that it is based on a foundation of transaction and not based on a foundation of love. A transactional relationship can be full of respect, affection, and mutual benefits, but, I would argue, not "love." At best, a man in a traditional transactional relationship can expect a very supportive dependent.

A large part of what men struggle with today in the dating market is that women, thanks to birth control and feminism, are able to provide their own provisioning and much of their own security. Women no longer 'need' men in the transactional way that women have traditionally needed men. When looking at it from an economic standpoint, if the transactional aspect of the relationship is to be maintained, then since women no longer place such a high value to the "currency" men have traditionally "paid" for the relationship (because she can get it herself) then the only way for a man to be successful is to pay a whole lot more of the devalued currency. Thus, only "very" wealthy men or "very" good-looking men (or both) can

expect to be successful with modern women. When looking at it this way, the average man is just… out of luck and born at the wrong time.

Here is the inevitable problem that Red Pill men face: when they do get the girl (and building character in this way will make men more attractive to women): Did he get her because he did all this stuff? If he can no longer maintain the SMV value and pay the higher level of devalued currency for his relationship, will she abandon him? If he got her by jacking up his value on these hierarchies and he gets into a car wreck, loses a leg and his six-pack, or suffers a job loss, then will she still want to be with him? Does she actually care about him, or only what he can provide for her, be it economic value, social value, entertainment value, sexual value, status value, or all of the above? The fact is, if a woman is only with a man because of the value he can provide her, then what these people have is a transactional relationship. No amount of respect or affection will be able to counter the fact that she is no longer getting what she contracted for. Red Pill has already done this math and came to the conclusion that:

Women are incapable of loving men the way they want to be loved.

When Red Pill sets the standard and "truth" that the reason women are attracted to men is their SMV and the reason men are attracted to women is their SMV, then Red Pill must come to the conclusion that the only type of relationship men and women can have is a transactional one. When men first "swallow the Red Pill," they enter a predictable stage called "Red Pill Rage." What they are raging against is the idea that they've been lied to their entire lives, and that what they thought was real love is nothing more than a value exchange. All that is left for men who want a relationship is to strive to be the alpha and hit as many "hypergamy triggers" as possible so that she will stay interested and maybe not cuck him.

How depressing. Hell, I'd go MGTOW, too.

So how is it that men want to be loved, but Red Pill does not believe women are capable? **A love not based on his productivity or what he can do for her or what role he can fill in her life, but a love that accepts him as he is—a work in progress with flaws and weaknesses. A love of radical acceptance of him as a person who is just figuring things out as he goes—just like the rest of us. A love that is not based on conditions or prequalification. To be loved for just existing. The way a mother/parent loves their child.**

Red Pill believes that women cannot love idealistically, or love

for the sake of loving. Red Pill believes that women can only love opportunistically—or, to put it another way, only in a transactional sense. Red Pill believes that women can only "love" (emotionally invest in, emotionally connect with) a man who is able to maintain that love in spite of the woman's hypergamous nature always driving her to seek opportunities to trade up.

So let us look at how it is a parent loves their child and see if we can't come up with a definition for 'love,' and see if we can't examine how women want to be loved and see if there is, in fact, a difference between how men and women want to be loved.

The first thing I believe we need to define about "love" is that it is not an emotion—love is actions. A healthy parent shows love to their child through actions that are in the child's best interests and independent of any needs the parent may have.

A healthy parent gives their children mostly healthy foods, but treats them every so often. A healthy parent keeps their children physically active, but lets them rest when sick or injured. A healthy parent exercises the child's minds in multiple different ways, but lets them follow their interests as much as is reasonably possible. A healthy parent ensures their children remain social and will occasionally force them out of their comfort zone for growth and challenge. You'll notice that most of these things are not what the kid wants—the kid wants to live off junk food and watch TV and play video games all day.

If a parent forced their child to live off frozen pizza and Netflix, that parent wouldn't be very loving even if the kid was happy about it. A parent who indulges and enables bad habits is a parent who needs something from their child—this unhealthy parent needs love and acceptance back from the child. A healthy parent does not need their child to love them back, and this frees a healthy parent to act against the child's wishes in order to show love for the child—refusing TV, limiting candy, enforcing rules and discipline that the child does not like. This isn't to say that a parent does not welcome and cherish love from their own child, only that a healthy parent does not *need* it from the child.

A healthy parent does not need love from their child because a healthy parent is secure in their own worth and ability. Even when the child screams and rages at the parent, the parent can love that child—unconditionally. A healthy parent has enough love inside them that they do not need a reciprocal relationship from their child—the parent's inner "love cup" is so full that it can overflow and pour into the child's with no expectation of receiving anything back. A healthy parent/child relationship is primarily one-way, with the parent

providing regular acts of love meant to ensure the immediate and long-term health and happiness of the child. Love is actions. Love is a decision to show love, made again and again, without expecting love in return.

This is the kind of love men want and the kind of love Red Pill believes women are not capable of. For the most part, the men I encounter in Red Pill would love (or would have loved) to find a good woman and settle down, but because they do not believe women are capable of giving them what they want, they become jaded. These men either become stuck in their trauma or get traumatized and stuck by Red Pill's ideology.

The next time you get the chance, I encourage you to go to the magazine rack at your local grocery store and select one magazine marketed towards women and one magazine marketed towards men. Look at the wording in the advertisements of both. A lot of people talk about what you see on the woman's side: *Beauty. Sexy. Shape. Body. Desire. Erase. Anti-Age. Sculpt. Tame. Luxury. Young. Glamorous. Reduce. Imperfections. Flawless. Natural. Lovely. Formula*. But you rarely hear mention of the men's side: *Performance. Top. Excellence. Durability. Adaptation. Man Card. Protect. Stronger. Better. Real Men __. Rule. Exceptional. Men Are __. Effort. Strength. Provide. Manly. Maximum.* It's important to keep in mind that when advertisers are trying to sell you something, they don't describe reality—that concealer isn't going to make you look like a Maybelline model and that cologne isn't going to get you a Maybelline model. Instead, these ads prey upon your insecurities. Women are told from infancy that the most important thing about them is how they look. Men are told from infancy that the most important thing about them is what they can do. Women must preserve their value to be desired. Men must create value to be desired.

What is it that your friends do for you that qualifies them to be your friend? What do your male friends produce that you have deemed sufficiently valuable that you are willing to associate with them? What level of attractiveness have your female friends attained that you are willing to spend time with them? Or do you simply accept your friends as they are, knowing their flaws but admiring them anyway? Does any of that "value" people "must" have actually matter when it comes to you and your friends, so long as you get along and enjoy spending time together?

Healthy friendships are not inherently transactional and friends help each other out and support each other without necessarily expecting anything in return. I see a transactional relationship as a negotiation. A zero-sum game where my gain is your loss or you have

to give me something for me to give you something back. Nothing is built this way and can only be negotiated, so two people can only bring whatever pieces they've already created on their own and then slide them back and forth across the table during the ongoing negotiation.

This is the sort of relationship you see in employment or business. It's not necessarily unhealthy, so long as both parties understand that it's not love. It needs to be understood that in a transactional relationship, neither party is motivated to go all in. If they gave up all their pieces, there would be nothing left for them to bargain with. Going all in makes you vulnerable, and the nature of a transactional relationship is for the other person to maximize their gains at the expense of their partner. A transactional relationship is a zero-sum game where one's loss is another's gain. That doesn't mean it cannot be mutually beneficial, just that it cannot be love as we have defined it. The nature of a transactional relationship is to always hold back so you can negotiate from a position of strength. You can't give freely because you will be taken advantage of.

Love and friendships are things that are built together, one piece at a time. One person takes the chance to give a little bit more than they expect to receive, and then waits and sees what the other does with it. The person offering is strong enough and secure enough as an individual that they know they will be fine if betrayed or abandoned or taken advantage of. They have lots of their own pieces, so they can afford to lose a few here and there. The loss will not cripple them.

The trap Red Pill men and so many others find themselves in is that in order to receive genuine love, you have to be willing to be seen for who you are. You must be willing to be vulnerable. Because Red Pill does not believe women are capable of giving real love, Red Pill makes damn sure to teach men never to appear vulnerable. Red Pill claims that any vulnerability on the part of men will cause women to lose respect for him and leave him. They're right—for a transactional relationship.

Let me ask you this—when was the last time a friend of yours admitted, humbly, that they were wrong about something, and you lost respect for them because of that show of vulnerability? If you have healthy friendships, then this was a time when you reached out and supported your friend and encouraged their growth and maybe even acknowledged the courage it takes to admit to a mistake. In a transactional relationship, this show of vulnerability and admission of a mistake is ammunition to be stored and used later.

Red Pill makes no secret about the fact that it works on the

basis of risk avoidance—teaching men to never commit to women, to spin plates and keep multiple women who are interested in them around, and to avoid having children. In a world where a man believes he cannot be loved the way he wants to be loved and can only have a transactional relationship, this makes sense. If a man truly wants to be loved the way he wants to be loved, then he cannot practice risk avoidance and must start practicing risk mitigation.

The purpose of risk avoidance is to eliminate all possible risks from an endeavor. The purpose of risk mitigation is to identify risks, assess their potential damage and likelihood of occurrence, and then implement controls to minimize both the potential damage and likelihood of those risks occurring. The difference is that risk avoidance also eliminates all possible rewards from the taking on of risk, while risk mitigation does not. There is no marriage that is 100% divorce proof. There is no relationship that is 100% cheat proof. Guarantees do not exist in life.

When building real love and friendships, both parties are strong enough and secure enough that they don't "need" the other's reciprocation, but that doesn't mean it's not welcomed. If the other person doesn't take advantage and accepts with gratitude and humility? That is a wonderful thing and builds trust all on its own. If the other feels safe enough to find a way to give freely without expecting anything in return or framing it as "paying you back"? That's a gift. Piece by piece, trust is built.

Unless you are in the second grade, you don't go up to a person and ask "want to be best friends?" and have any reasonable expectation that it's going to work out. These things are built slowly. You won't know by the end of your first date if this person is someone you'd like to have a long-term relationship with, but you may have a good idea if this person is someone you're willing to lose one of your pieces to in the hopes that that piece might be the foundation for something more. In order to understand another's vulnerability, we must first have context about their character and personality. In order to see another person for who they really are, we have to see their weaknesses and vulnerabilities within the context of who they are. Dumping all your vulnerability pieces all at once offers no room for context, beyond the impression that you're a train wreck.

Love and friendship is built on a foundation of vulnerability, offered a bit at a time, until trust is established. Offering a bit more than you expect to receive is leading with a mindset of openness and vulnerability instead of a mindset of transaction. When the other gives back in kind, pieces stack on top of each other. One at a time, from one then the other, extra pieces are kept on the table and stacked on

top of one another. Over time, love and friendship creates more than either could achieve alone, because they are working together and building together. Real love and friendship is greater than the sum of its parts—it is something that builds. One person can maintain it for a time, but one person cannot build it alone.

The healthiest relationships are based on a foundation of friendship. They're the ultimate friends-with-benefits arrangement, and they are the type of relationship that can become more than the sum of its parts. A genuinely loving relationship is not a zero-sum game, and what one "gets" out of the relationship isn't necessarily what the other "gives." Spending time with the other is a joy in and of itself because both have taken the risk of offering that vulnerability, and both have been accepted, regardless. There is no power play. There are no games. There is only love. Real, genuine, love. Love doesn't keep score because it doesn't have to, and the reason it doesn't have to keep score is because it doesn't keep score.

Unfortunately, many romantic relationships are transactional and do not contain real "love" as we have defined it. Sometimes they are the relationships that are modeled for us and that were modeled for our parents. That doesn't mean that women are incapable of loving men the way they want to be loved.

I believe that, for the vast majority of men and women out there who believe this, the reason they keep finding transitional relationships is because they are terrified of the vulnerability required to be loved genuinely. Both men and women are afraid that were the other person to see who we truly are instead of what we can provide for them, then while the person we project might be impressive, the reality of our neuroses and bad habits and weaknesses would be too much. We would scare them away. We wouldn't be worth sticking around for. Without all the things we can provide and do for our partner, they would have to actually love us for us. This is the kind of love we all want, but in order for it to be possible for someone to love us for who we are, we would have to risk being rejected for who we are. To receive this kind of unconditional love, we must pay the price of vulnerability.

We have already seen that Red Pill men are craving acceptance from women, not just the sex they claim to be seeking. But by leading with SMV, they are actively selecting against the sort of woman who could provide him with the kind of love he most desperately wants.

Red Pill tactics work!

Yes, I believe they do and I recommend that all men (and women) should be doing a lot of what Red Pill recommends. I say it

just needs an entirely different foundation to explain why these things work, and I'd especially recommend getting away from the mindset of "increasing value."

Things like taking care of your health, being in good physical condition, paying attention to your appearance, working to ensure your own financial security, and having basic social skills like how to introduce yourself to a stranger is just Adulting 101 and should be considered as such. All these things are what a person does to meet their own needs—health needs, financial needs, social needs, friendship needs, even spiritual needs. That doesn't mean a lot of people don't need to be told to do these things, and that doesn't mean that these things are easy to do, only that thinking of it in "raising my value" terms leads to thinking you're not "valuable enough" or haven't "earned" love or relationships with the opposite sex. Men and women have always offered a sort of currency to the other—men offer provisioning and security, women provide sex and fertility. I'm not saying a transactional relationship is inherently unhealthy, only that it is not love as we have defined it.

Red Pill says it time and time again and they are correct: Attraction cannot be negotiated. Therefore, it cannot be earned, only felt freely. Love, likewise, cannot be earned, only given. Taking care of Adulting 101 stuff gives men and woman a lot of context about a person's character—specifically that they respect and love themselves. That's no small benchmark, but it hasn't "earned" them shit. If we examine the way a mother loves her child—the way Red Pill men believe women cannot love them, we see that a mother gives love without expecting it in return. She is secure enough in herself and her ability to be a mother that she doesn't need her kid to love or even like her in order to be a good mother and set boundaries and encourage good habits. The kid never has to "earn" love if mom is healthy.

The reason why taking care of the Adulting 101 stuff attracts the opposite sex isn't because it raises a person's value enough that they have earned other's desire, it's because these things signal that this person is secure in themselves. That they love themselves. That maybe, just maybe… this is a person who could love us, too. Adulting 101 things indicate this is not someone who needs a transactional relationship to mimic real love or needs to keep score or who has requirements we must meet and maintain to "qualify" for them, but someone who is mature enough and secure enough in themselves that they are capable of giving genuine love without needing anything back. Someone who has filled their own love-cup so full that it can overflow into ours. That is what we all want, and these basic Adulting

101 things are benchmarks that tell us who these people are.

Red Pill's basic tactics and advice give men the missing lessons that (for many of them) their unhealthy mothers and fathers did not provide. You see, dear reader—a healthy mother, a healthy parent, makes themselves obsolete once their child reaches adulthood. A parent who does not need their child to love them back teaches their child how to love themselves and become independent of the parent. A healthy parent is a parent who does not need their child to need them. Love is actions. Love is taking care of a person's needs. Love is teaching another how to love themselves. Love is something we chose to give—first to ourselves through the acts of meeting our own needs, and then to others. For the men of Red Pill who need to be told how to meet their own needs—clearly they didn't have someone who taught them these lessons in the first place. Maybe their parents were absent, maybe they were unhealthy, or maybe they'd never been taught how to love themselves in the first place.

Here is the true irony of Red Pill's teachings: by beating into men's heads that they have to earn women's love and approval through raising their SMV, a Red Pill man will, of course, lead with the value he's created which he believes women want—his physique, his job, his possessions, his "frame." By doing this, a Red Pill man is showing women exactly the sort of relationship he is willing to offer her—a transactional one. Women who love themselves and are capable of giving the kind of love Red Pill men claim to want will recognize what he is offering as something that only mimics the kind of relationship she wants, and will reject him quickly. The only women who will engage with him are the women either so needing to love *someone* that they will put up with anything, do anything for a shred of affection, and don't have the greatest self respect, or women perfectly happy to have a transactional relationship and who will happily and easily move onto the next guy if she gets an opportunity to trade up and get more for her effort. Because of this sample bias, the more a Red Pill man interacts with women, the more his Red Pill beliefs that all women are the same and none are capable of the kind of relationship he truly wants are reinforced.

Let's run through a quick scenario as a way to illustrate the built-in toxicity of Red Pill's foundational ideology and how it traps men in their own self-made hell: The Neg.

A "neg," or "negging," is the pickup artist tactic of disqualifying a woman from the man's interest ("you don't seem like my type"). It has evolved into a more emotionally manipulative tactic of mildly insulting a woman with a backhanded compliment or with qualified approval in order to prey on her insecurities ("Nice eyes,

even if one is bigger than the other"). A neg is simply a tactic, and one that works on a lot of women. Like we talked about all the way back in Chapter One, a "neg" is a tactic based on a praxeology. Red Pill takes this and then goes into ideology when it explains why the neg works. Red Pill says that negs work because women want a man with a higher status than her own, and by putting her down he is hijacking her into thinking that he sees himself as higher in status than her, so maybe she should pay attention. Negs, according to Red Pill, specifically hack her perceptions of a man's value by a demonstration that he is higher in status than she is. By putting her "down," he is making her more attracted to him. The logical conclusion of this is that women "want," whether they admit it or not, to be put down by men and to be "lower" than men. It just gets them all the hornier. Any resistance to this conclusion is just a woman fighting her own inherent nature. There are other explanations as to why negs work, but Red Pill does what Red Pill is best at and has decided that its interpretation is the objectively true one and the only interpretation that is valid. Since Red Pill's interpretation is "truth," as evidenced by the fact that negs work as often as they do, the natural conclusion is that women are wired to want to be "below" the men in their lives and, no matter what women say, they will be happiest when they are. After all—we must judge women by their actions and not their words, correct? And since Red Pill has already decided upon women's motivations and women's psychological reactions to negs, it's pretty clear to Red Pill that women will truly be happiest when she is lower than her man.

This logically leads to conclusions like "women are shooting themselves in the foot by going to college and becoming high achievers because there will be so few men above her that she could be happy with. If she focused on not achieving and competing with men and instead worked to secure a high-value man, then she would be most fulfilled being a mother with a strong man leading her." A Red Pill father, because he loves his daughter, is going to teach her about hypergamy and why she should focus on securing a man in her early 20s when her SMV is highest and forgo college until her children are older. The logical deduction from this initial ideology of "why" negs work is that a woman's purpose in life and the focus of her effort should be her man. Individual Red Pill men may disagree with me on these logical extrapolations, but anyone who is even passingly familiar with the Red Pill community cannot deny that these sentiments are common and widely held. It's the foundational ideology that causes the toxicity and misogyny so prevalent in Red Pill communities, not the tactics.

Say a woman follows this advice. She accepts the transactional type of relationship demanded by Red Pill men, with the man winning

the inevitable power struggle. She is in his frame—they are not building a life together; she is fitting into a life he has already built. This woman is literally everything Red Pill says a high-value man should look for were he to take the ill-advised route of having a long-term relationship. This woman is also ambitious, or even just materialistic, and wants more than what she has. Like we've talked about before, this is not a character flaw and instead a marker of every living thing on this planet—if ever we became fully satisfied with what we have, we would stop working, stop achieving, and as a species we would be surpassed by one who could never quite quench their thirst. Everyone wants more than what they have. But, because all her focus and energy has been on maintaining her beauty so that a man will support her instead of improving herself so she has the option of supporting herself, her value is not her own and is instead dependent upon her husband. She is in his life and supporting him in his ambitions—they are not in each other's lives and supporting each other's ambitions. She cannot fulfil her ambitions in this dynamic, but can only be compensated for her sacrifice in not pursuing them. She cannot improve her circumstances by providing better services or by working harder, so the only solution is to provide those same services to a richer man.

Red Pill breeds the very hypergamy it fears and then blames women for it.

I want to say at this point that I'm not arguing that every man who follows Red Pill is toxic or a misogynist. I am explaining how the fundamental ideology inevitably leads to toxicity and misogyny. Red Pill doesn't say men have to put their women down—Red Pill teaches that a man who is high enough over her won't have to put her down in order to hit on her "hypergamy triggers" and create happiness for the both of them.

How magnanimous of Red Pill. What Red Pill is saying is that the reasons negs work is because it puts women down. The resulting logical conclusions is that equality is the toxic and unnatural thing and that women should be in a man's life and should be lower in status than her man, lest she eventually tires of him. This isn't seen by Red Pill as demeaning to women—it's seen as "accepting reality" based on the "truths" proven by how Red Pill interprets things. According to Red Pill, women having the same opportunities and rights as men and having the audacity to try and fulfil their own ambitions is the cause of our social and moral collapse.

So—do men truly love idealistically and women solipsistically? Are men naturally more inclined to love for the sake of love, instead of expecting anything back? Are women incapable of loving a man

when he has nothing to offer her in return?

In 2009, researchers followed over 500 married couples after a serious medical illness likely to result in death or permanent disability (multiple sclerosis, brain tumor, etc.) was diagnosed in one of the partners. This is a situation where the "in sickness and in health" clause of the marriage vows is put to the ultimate test—the ill partner cannot uphold their end of a transactional relationship. They are physically incapable of providing whatever it was they were providing their partner when the transactional arrangement was made. In order for the marriage to stay intact, real love—the kind of love we have defined, the kind of love that gives without any expectation of receiving—must be present.

The good news first: 88% of the time, the healthy partner stood by their spouse. The vast majority of the time, we can reasonably theorize that real love was present in these marriages.

Now for the bad news: of the 11.6% of couples who divorced, six times as often it was the wife who got sick versus the husband. When the man got sick, his chance of spousal abandonment was 2.9%, but when the woman got sick, her risk jumped to 20.8%. The single best indicator for spousal abandonment when diagnosed with a serious illness is if the patient is female (Glantz, MJ).

This study was repeated in 2015 with a much larger sample size. Only 6% of those marriages ended in divorce (more good news), but the original link between the wife's declining health and divorce risk was reproduced. Men who got sick faced no significant increase in divorce risk than healthy men, but that was not true for women (Karraker, A).

When the chips are down and the ultimate test of commitment and loving for love's sake is faced, the vast majority of both men and women pull through. But when they don't, it is disproportionately more likely that a woman will be abandoned when she can no longer offer her spouse anything than is for a man. The harsh truth is that we are all naturally solipsistic and neither men nor women get to claim any sort of moral high ground. We all just prefer to see ourselves in the best light, so we all spin rationalization hamsters and tell ourselves stories that cast ourselves in the best possible light—like how Red Pill teaches that men are the true romantics and love idealistically, while only women love solipsistically. Men are not wired to love more idealistically than women are—we all can be idealistic, if we chose to be. We can all be solipsistic, if we chose to be.

Is there any data to back up my claim that Red Pill men, by

using Red Pill tactics, are giving themselves a selection bias? Yes, there it.

In 2011, researchers at the University of Kansas decided to test the pickup artist tactics advocated by the world's most popular PUA book, *The Game* by Neil Strauss. The researchers were interested in if there was any relationship between the types of women typical PUA tactics work on and their level of sociosexuality and sexism.

Sociosexuality is the degree to which individuals require emotional closeness and commitment prior to engaging in sex. Higher levels of sociosexuality, or unrestricted sociosexuality, are people more open to the idea of casual sex and short-term sexual relationships. Low levels of sociosexuality, or restrictive sociosexuality, are people more inclined to wait until they are in a committed relationship before having sex.

Sexism comes in two types—hostile sexism and benevolent sexism. Hostile sexism is generally what you think of when you think of "sexism" and is characterized by a negative and misogynistic attitude towards women, and particularly towards women who violate traditional gender norms. Someone with a high level of hostile sexism will typically believe that women are overly emotional, less intelligent, and, for the most part, incompetent when compared to men. Someone with high levels of hostile sexism would agree with the statement that "Women seek to gain power by getting control over men." Someone with a high level of hostile sexism would believe that a woman is a bad mother if she chooses to work outside of the home when she had the ability to stay home with her children.

Benevolent sexism is characterized by endorsing stereotypical positive beliefs towards women. Someone with a high level of benevolent sexism will believe that women are naturally more "good" and "pure" than men and should be protected by men. They would agree with the statement, "A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man." To be clear, benevolent sexism is not "helping women out" or endorsing some gendered affirmative action policy. Benevolent sexism is believing that women are too delicate and fragile to do anything other than fill a traditional role, and if they are trying to step out of that role, then they need special accommodations and shouldn't be expected to perform as well as men.

As a whole, we can think of benevolent and hostile sexism as people who highly value traditional gender norms and see those roles as the kind of relationship that would be optimal for them. I prefer thinking in these terms because I don't necessarily believe that hostile or benevolent sexism are "bad" things. I believe the "bad" is when a person fails to recognize that their values are not shared by everyone

and tries to enforce their values onto others who may have different values and want different things. Women who score high in hostile and/or benevolent sexism would value traditionally masculine men and would value traditional femininity in herself. Men with high levels of sexism would value a household setup where mom stays home and takes care of the kids while Dad financially supports them, while men with low levels of sexism would be more open to the idea of, when it made sense, a household where Dad stayed home with the kids and Mom was the primary breadwinner. A woman with low levels of sexism won't care as much about traditionally masculine traits, such as height and defined musculature, and would be more open to relationships with men who do not fit this stereotypical masculine mold.

Men, overall, scored higher on hostile and benevolent sexism as well as higher in sociosexuality than women, although sociosexuality was not correlated one way or another with hostile or benevolent sexism.

The use of more assertive strategies by men, as described by *The Game,* was directly predictable by his level of sociosexuality. This means that men with high levels of sociosexuality preferred more assertive courtship strategies. A man's level of sexism was not correlated with his preferred strategy.

Women also showed no correlation between their levels of sexism and their sociosexuality. The women who were most receptive to the assertive strategies, however, were those with both high levels of hostile sexism and high levels of sociosexuality (Hall, Jeffrey).

To translate all of this back into English, what this study is saying is that men who are more inclined to favor short-term sexual relationships are those most drawn to the kinds of strategies recommended by Red Pill and PUAs. Women most receptive to these strategies are women who also favor short-term sexual relationships *and* who are drawn to stereotypically masculine men.

When we understand the roots of Red Pill, which is that it began as a way to explain why PUA techniques work, then it starts to make sense why Red Pill came to the conclusion that men should adopt more and more stereotypical masculine, or "alpha," traits in order to attract more women. It's not that all women are attracted to stereotypically masculine men, it's that the women most receptive to PUA tactics are attracted to stereotypically masculine men. Red Pill is suffering from selection bias—Red Pill men are only interacting with women who (1) enjoy casual sex and probably have a high bodycount, and (2) who are attracted to stereotypically alpha men.

Even Red Pill acknowledges this selection bias, to a point. Roosh V. called it a "fuck funnel" and stated that even an experienced PUA can expect only a 2-4% return on investment when approaching women. 96-98% of the time, a man using these tactics can expect to get rejected (Valizadeh, Roosh 2013). Somehow, however, Red Pill has extrapolated the actions of 2-4% of the women they approach to mean that all women value the same things and all women are receptive to the same courtship strategies.

If you disregard Red Pill's assumed "truths" of women being driven by alpha-seed beta-need to have sex with a minority of males, then there is a pretty common-sense obviousness to the idea that using seduction techniques which imply you have a certain value set regarding sex will attract partners who share that same value set regarding sex. This theory matches well with our data from *Relationships in America* and others which indicate that far from alpha-seed beta-need being the norm with a majority of women having sex with a minority of men, people with similar sociosexuality are matching up together (French, Juliana). I've hammered in the idea of not pointing to a single study or data point and yelling "fact!", so while this study is a very interesting one, I will only say that more of its kind are needed for verification. My hypothesis, however, is that any future studies will back up this initial one's claim that Red Pill's tactics specifically target women with more unrestricted sociosexuality. In other words, Red Pill specifically targets the minority of women who are promiscuous, are most open to short-term sexual relationships, and who are most attracted to stereotypically alpha men. Or, to put it a different way—no, not all women are like that.

Let's take another look at the neg, and see if we can't find a different explanation than "women want to be put in their place." For all Red Pill's talk about how women are the solipsistic ones and cannot see the world from anything other than a woman's perspective, the men of Red Pill sure have a hard time seeing the world from anything other than a man's perspective:

The reason why negs work isn't because it tricks a woman into thinking a man is higher status than her, it's because he's offering a type of relationship equality that, in a woman's world, is rare and precious—and exactly what she most craves.

All my life, from before puberty until long after I married my hubby at age 22, men made it clear that they didn't want to spend time with me without the chance of sex eventually happening. This isn't because I was anything special or some great beauty—only that it is reality for young women to be desired by every kind of man. I can't

tell you how many male friends I *thought* I had who, inevitably, made a move that I rejected. From that moment on, they were no longer my friend. They weren't willing to interact with me, spend time with me, or even talk with me. What I thought was genuine friendship was to them a transaction that I failed to pay up on.

I like sex as much as the next woman (maybe even more), but when you add up all the minutes in a lifetime, 99% of them have nothing to do with sex. Every relationship with men I was being offered was a transactional one—a relationship where if I gave my 1%, maybe he'd tolerate the other 99% of me.

I'm thirty-six and I understand more now than I did then that those boys and young men probably were genuinely interested in my 99%, but didn't know how to handle the blow to their young egos. They chose to leave instead of stay and face the awkwardness. Nevertheless, by their actions they told me, loud and clear, that their interest of my 99% was contingent on my 1%, not independent of it. I am 100% of a person, and if I'm going to be spending potentially twenty-four hours with someone for the rest of my life, I want them to value the 99% of me independent of the 1% and not just be willing to tolerate the 99% since I throw in the 1%. Except for my father and some (not all) of my uncles, not a single man in my life indicated that he valued me for anything other than what I could provide for him, or who I felt wouldn't try for the 1%, if given half a chance.

Men are not the only ones who doubt that the opposite sex can love them the way they want to be loved—for who we are as people instead of how we can fit into his preconceived shape of how a "wife" or "girlfriend" or "fuckbuddy" would fit into his life. Even when I started dating, I could feel large parts of me didn't fit into these shapes the men were trying to force me into. The parts that were me but didn't fit into what he wanted from me were unimportant to him and not something he was willing to deal with. I was somehow expected to either amputate or ignore those parts of myself when he was around. I was never treated badly by these men, but I was never shown real love, either.

I met Hubby in college when he offered to tutor classmates who were struggling in chemistry. We formed a small group and ended up hanging out and becoming good friends over the course of a year. I kept waiting for him to make a move and "prove" yet again that the only value a man could see in me was because of what I could provide for him. I waited a long time.

Eventually, I began to develop romantic feelings for my friend and future husband, but experience had taught me that he couldn't feel the same. Just before our last semester before graduation, I

decided to “get him out of my system,” because I was still young and dumb enough to think that would actually work. I made a no-strings offer. He turned me down.

My hubby was the first man, and the only man, who demonstrated to me that he valued me as a whole person. To him, my 99% was valuable even without the 1%. He didn’t just want me for the role I could play in his life or for what he could get out of me, but instead because of who I was as a whole person. My husband was no super-Chad or alpha male and to this day would be considered a low-value beta male by Red Pill, but as he told me then, “I don’t want to lose you as a friend.” Cliché as the phrase is, it made a hell of an impression. He refused my 1% so that he could keep my 99%. I, as a person, was more valuable to him than what I could offer him. My husband led with, and showed me, a type of relationship that I didn’t know could exist.

My husband gave me the greatest gift a young woman can possibly receive: the gift of a man valuing her for who she is instead of what she can give him. He gave me himself, and the radical acceptance of myself. Negs don’t work because they indicate a man is higher than the woman, negs work because they indicate *that a man doesn’t want to have sex with that woman*. Yet, by the very fact that he is talking to her, this man is showing that he is interested in her. If he’s not interested in her 1%, then all that is left is her 99%. Negs work because they hack into the hope women have that maybe, just maybe, he’s interested in her 99% independent of what transactional things she can provide for him. Negs work because, in a bizarre and twisted sort of way, they mimic the way women want to be loved by men—for who they are, and not just for what they can provide for them. Negs work because they are indicating a man is interested in a genuine relationship based on real love and equality, instead of the transactional relationships she’s been offered all her life. Negs work because they indicate, much like all that Adulting 101 indicates, that maybe this is a man who could love her the way we all want to be loved.

It’s not necessarily the tactics that are toxic—it is the foundational ideology. The original type of neg, the disqualification from a man’s interest, is little more than playful teasing. The thing that negging has evolved into under the ideology of Red Pill’s influence is intentionally preying upon another person’s emotional insecurities. The neg is not the problem—the ideology is. The fact that negs work does not mean what Red Pill thinks it means. The foundation is flawed.

When men believe that the only things they have to offer in a

relationship are the same things that men have always offered in relationships (provisioning), but women no longer value those things as much because they can provide their own provisioning, then the amount of the “currency” men have to pay goes way up. If this currency, which she values less, is all she's getting, then she's going to require a lot of it.

Relationships are no longer a necessity, they are a luxury. The circumstances have changed and so has the currency—specifically, there are more currency options now. When men and women offer vulnerability, emotional equality, and an interest in each other as individuals instead of interest in how they can fill a preconceived roll in the other’s life, this is when interesting things happen. Things like public school teachers and artists and "low-value men" (by Red Pill's standards) having healthy, long-lasting marriages. Things like men with “incel-level looks” being the first in his group to get a girlfriend. These men offer something the rich and alpha men simply have been unwilling to offer: themselves. And what they have to gain isn’t just a supportive dependent to cheer them on in this constant challenge that is life, but a full-fledged partner to stand by him, shoulder to shoulder, and take on life with him.

Genuine attraction cannot be negotiated. If a woman doesn’t have sex with a man soon after meeting him, that just means she’s not truly attracted to him. – or – **When a woman has casual sex with a man, that's proof that she's actually attracted to him.**

I’ve noticed a clear mentality within the Red Pill community that if a man has sex, it must be because of some high-value trait or skill level, because sex is harder to get for men, whereas if a woman has sex it is from a lack of self-control or restraint because women get so many opportunities for sex. Thus, men “prove” high-value by being able to “conquer” the social and psychological barriers keeping women from having sex, and women “prove” low-value by not having sufficiently strong barriers in place. Men are strong enough to overcome, women are weak enough to succumb.

This follows the classic misogynistic mindset of “sex happens to a woman, not with her.” It frames women’s sexuality as something to be gained by men, rather than something that belongs to her as an individual. Men can possess their own sexuality in the sense that their motivations can come from within themselves, but a woman’s sexuality is not her own because it is entirely dependent on the man who “gets” it. If he is low-value, then so is she because of how little work he had to put into getting sex, but if a man has sex with a low-value woman, then his status is not in question because that was just a

smaller obstacle than usual to hurtle over. It still takes skill to hurtle a low obstacle.

According to the Red Pill model, men "take" sex and women "give" it in a transactional power move. Sex isn't something shared, it's a zero-sum adversarial game. It's a mindset that turns a woman into an object that dispenses sex instead of an individual capable of sharing sex with a man. Instead of an act that can work to strengthen bonds and express any measure of emotion from friendship to love to respectful curiosity, it becomes a mere biological insertion and just as meaningless and disposable as the body it came from.

Women with high bodycounts are sluts who just give themselves away to any guy. And it doesn't mean anything to him because guys will fuck anything, so really she just doesn't respect herself because she's giving away a lot more than she's getting. It's not hypocritical because women have evolved to be the choosy ones—they are the gatekeepers of sex. Men have sex with who they're allowed to, but women have sex with who they choose to, and so any woman who has a high bodycount is going against her nature while any man with a high bodycount is embracing his.

To be fair, this is not an attitude unique to Red Pill and, in fact, is rather ingrained into our American culture. In 2011, the MPAA (Motion Picture Association of America) gave the movie Sucker Punch an R rating because of a particular sex scene. The movie's producers were targeting a younger audience and wanted a PG-13 rating, so they asked what they could do to reduce the rating. The MPAA had no issue with the sex scene itself, only that the female character was enjoying herself too much and giving too much consent. When the producers edited the clip down, the MPAA approved the PG-13 rating, but at that point, according to the film producers, the sex scene looked like she was being assaulted.

The issue wasn't the sex—the issue was a woman being portrayed as being into sex without first being "worn down" by the man, or using sex as a tactic to manipulate a man. She was having sex for the joy of having sex, just because she wanted to instead of being an object the man had to conquer or as a means to a man's pleasure, and it was literally deemed obscene. Coercive sex where the woman was clearly not giving consent, but was upholding gender norms, was deemed perfectly acceptable for 13-year-olds to view (Polo, Susana).

This was not an outlier for the MPAA. *The Cooler* was initially issued an NC-17 rating because an actresses' pubic hair was showing in a scene heavily implying cunnilingus. In practice, blow jobs are common in R-rated films and occasionally fit into PG-13 films, but cunnilingus will automatically get a NC-17 rating. When women are

portrayed as having sexual agency, when women are portrayed as experiencing pleasure instead of being an instrument of male pleasure, it is deemed "aberrational behavior." Just like how men who don't "do gender correctly" and become primary caretakers of small children are treated with predatory suspicion, women who do not conform to accepted sexual gender roles are deemed deviant and indecent. The only acceptable sexual role for women in American media is that of the Madonna or the Whore—the woman whose boundaries are "overcome" by a man, consent or no, and the woman who uses sex to manipulate men. Her sexual pleasure is assumed to make viewers uncomfortable. In *Jersey Girl*, the movie received an R rating instead of a PG-13 rating based on a scene where a fully clothed female character spoke about how often she masturbated. In that same scene, a male character also talked about how often he masturbated, but his dialogue was not seen as being problematic for a PG-13 rating. In 1999, the film *American Pie* received an R rating for showing the nude butt of a teenaged boy while he masturbated into an apple pie. Also in 1999, the film *But I'm a Cheerleader* received an NC-17 rating for showing a fully clothed and covered teenaged girl masturbating against a wall (*This Film is Not Yet Rated)*. Both in film and in life, when a woman claims her sexuality as her own outside of a man's pleasure, she is judged far more harshly than men who claim their own sexuality are.

In reality, women have sex for all kinds of reasons, and sometimes those reasons have little to do with the man in question. Red Pill seems to have a mindset that the only reasons a woman decides to have sex with a man is because (1) he's so damn alpha and sexually appealing that she can't help her hypergamy, or (2) he's beta enough and willing to provide enough that she's willing to trade sex for what he's offering. Madonna, meet Whore.

Many Red Pill men believe that women as a whole use their easier access to sex in the way they would—to have more sex. I can't tell you how many Red Pill men I've come across who legitimately believe that most women are riding what they call a "cock carousel" and are literally having sex with hundreds of men. Not just the 2-3% of women who report 50 or more sexual partners that we've discussed already, but most women. As in, it is the norm for a woman to have hundreds of sex partners. The deeper these men get into Red Pill and the longer they spend online in the more toxic echo chambers of Red Pill, the more this certainty is reinforced for them.

This does breed a distinct misogyny in these men, although its core seems to be less about the fact that these women are seen as sluts and more about the fact that these men believe women are having so

much sex *and* are not having sex with them personally. Since they believe there is a literal buffet of sex to be had for the Alphas and Chads at the top, any rejection by a woman feels all the worse. Essentially, while the woman is saying "I'm just not that into you," what these men hear is "I'll have sex with soooooo many men… just not with you, you loser."

At their core, these men don't hate women because of their sexual history. These men hate women because, in his mind, women have judged him as not being worthy of sex and love. These men, as we have discussed, want to be wanted more than they want sex, but they link getting sex to the emotional need of being wanted. Also, as we've seen, both men and women have that same emotional need—to be wanted for who they are, for their 99%. In many ways, men seem to try and meet this emotional need through getting sex, while women try and meet this same emotional need through not giving sex.

If there is one thing I have learned in all my research into Red Pill, it's that men and women live in entirely different worlds when it comes to sex. It means different things to men and women. It's desired in different ways. And the underlying assumptions about motivations and drives and meaning are so diametrically opposed that what is obvious to one may not even occur to the other.

The best way I know how to go about explaining this is to tackle the often-referenced scenario of when women (and in particular the young attractive women that Red Pill specifically targets) will have casual sex quickly with some men (alphas) but "make betas wait for sex."

The most common response women give to this charge is by saying that "husband" or "boyfriend material" men are men that the woman is emotionally invested in. Since she's not emotionally invested in one-night-stand guy, having sex with him isn't a big deal because she knows it's never going to develop into anything more. Long-term-potential guy, however, because of her emotional interest, has the power to break her heart and cause emotional turmoil if she risks opening herself to him with sex. By waiting, she is making sure he is interested in her 99% and not just her 1%. I believe there is truth to this, but it's a bit more involved. All in all, this explanation doesn't sit well with Red Pill men, either:

You are missing the point. The issue isn't that she fucks right away or waits for it. It's whether she applies the same standard across the board, and in the event that she doesn't, her reasoning for doing so.

It is an insult, and it is a punishment, sex is a reward not because

of the physical act that any loveless hooker could give, but because it signifies actual desire and shows that she never actually desired you. If a man has a girlfriend that made him wait for months after sleeping with Chads in a day or a week, he would be childishly naive not to suspect her motives and what actions she may take discretely.

What's not to understand: a woman making you "wait" for something she gave to others immediately means you're lesser in her mind. If hypothetically she makes everyone wait equally that's different, but that's not the reality for most women.

While I think women should not be judged for not putting out on the first date (and the ones who do shouldn't too), my line of reasoning is: "If she doesn't put out on the first date, she's probably not attracted to you." It's not about getting sex itself. It's about her being attracted to you.

It's not that they should put out on the first date. It's that they shouldn't play games or wait an arbitrary amount of time. Make everyone pay the same price so to speak.

She is only considering herself and not the impact her actions have on someone she wants to have a relationship with. That's a terrible way to go about it. If you value someone enough to want them to be your boyfriend or husband, why would you treat them inferior to some random guy?

You can't just let a guy bypass your filter, knowingly let him pump and dump and leave just because his looks makes your minge twinge. Meanwhile "boyfriend material" has to jump through hoops and go on multiple dates to get the same perks as an attractive guy? Women you're fucking up if you date like this.

This is wrong. Men want women to be consistent with the criteria for having sex. Don't make one guy jump through hoops, but let another guy get it without going on a date.

Very clearly, we are seeing the concept of sex as a zero-sum where men have to pay a "price" for sex. Since Red Pill sees sex and relationships as transactional, then it's simply unfair that women will lower the price for some men and raise it for others. Women who do this are seen as hypergamous, hypocritical sluts who are likely to cuck any decent man who is willing to give her a chance. After all—she's proven she can't resist the sex appeal of alphas in the past, so why should any man expect her to be able to resist an alpha in the future? Once the "truth" of sex as a transaction is assumed, any "price discrimination" is seen as the result of a woman's alpha-seed beta-

need hypergamy. Any attempt by women to explain their reasoning or how they see the situation is brushed off as hypocritical hamster-wheel rationale.

The radical concept that a woman could be a sovereign sexual being all on her own instead of being defined by the men who conquer her is, at best, an alien one. But I will give it a shot.

Women have sex and don't for all sorts of reasons, and often they have nothing to do with the man in question. Sometimes they have everything to do with the man in question—just not in the ways Red Pill interprets it. Meaningless and casual hookups are pleasurable and stress relievers and provide validation for women as well as men. The thing you have to remember about us women and sex—we get judged much more harshly for our sex life. That doesn't mean we can't enjoy it just as shallowly as men can, it just means we have more consequences to deal with. Thus, if all a woman wants is something casual, it makes sense for her to seek a complete stranger who is well removed from her social circle and to minimize the amount of time spent with him. A lot of women play the hookup game in the same way as men—if they hook up quickly, it's because they've already decided the guy isn't "long-term material," so why invest extra time?

Extra time spent means extra chances that those consequences will come home to bite her. If a woman has decided she wants to get laid, then that is a drive coming from within and not a reaction to a man she sees as attractive. The funny and smart guy can be just as validating and fun as the good-looking guy, but good looking is a lot easier to spot from across the room, so that usually wins when she's on the prowl. The thing to keep in mind, though—she's on the prowl in this situation. She's already made up her mind to seek casual sex. That's coming from her. You don't go to the grocery store to get milk if you hadn't already decided you wanted milk. One milk carton might look more interesting than the other, but one way or another, she's going home with some milk. She didn't just randomly wonder into the store without the intent to purchase. If all that's left from the Saturday rush is the store brand that expires tomorrow, then that's good enough.

Relationships are a whole different animal. The mechanics may look the same to the untrained eye (insert Tab A into Slot B), but to the untrained eye a single woman having a casual bang looks the same as a woman in a committed relationship having an affair—in truth they are very different behaviors.

Relationships are about sharing your life with someone—and more to the point, about sharing someone with your life. Slut-shaming is a very real consequence that women must deal with—women who

are seen as “easy” are not seen as simply having a high sex drive, but as “unreliable,” “less competent,” and “less emotionally stable” than women seen as not promiscuous. Men with the same sexual credentials were only perceived negatively by other men who did not want him around their partners, but promiscuous men’s sexual history did not cause others to generally perceive him in a negative light (Vrangalova, Zhana, et al.).

For women, one of the “common-sense” assumptions about sex is that her unrelated sexual activity can affect everything from her professional opportunities at work, to her relationships with her family, to the social dynamics of her friend groups. This is a consequence that must be mediated.

“Long-term-potential” men are necessarily a part of a woman’s social circle. She’s going to be introducing them to friends, family, and coworkers. There is a lot more social risk with them, so she has to make sure she’s not going to face social consequences. A woman can’t just sleep with them and never see them again. If a woman is making a guy wait for sex, it’s because she expects to see him again. She likes him. Likes him, likes him. She’s not just okay with using him for his body because she’s horny—she likes him. As a person. She likes his 99%.

Men don’t face this same immense stigma, so I do understand why men have such a hard time grasping the concept. Women sometimes will make husband-material wait for sex because of the incredible slut-shaming social consequences that will occur if we don’t.

A comparable situation is like if a man took a bunch of women out on dates, wined and dined them, but with you he was only willing to “hangout.” If a woman found that out down the road they would most definitely make a big deal about it.

Same logic as if a man treats one woman to fancy dates, listens to her problems, treats her like a princess, but then acts like a cold asshole to another type of woman. Regardless of how a man might justify it, one type of person is rewarded while the other is punished.

For women to understand, this is the equivalent of a guy you've been dating for months telling you that he had taken several, colder and less interested women on nicer/fancier dates, showered them with more compliments and paid more attention to them in order to seem more "gentlemanly" and win them over... However with you a split coffee at Starbucks was all he needed because you made the mistake of being very receptive,

friendly and responsive to him from the get-go.

Red Pill men see this behavior as punishing "good" men by withholding sex and rewarding "bad" men by giving sex easily. This makes sense when viewed from the mindset of a transactional nature of sex, where women provide sex and men want sex.

However, this common comparison to relationship commitment isn't really a fair one because Red Pill men recognize that sometimes whether a man offers a relationship or not depends more on where the man is in his life and mindset, rather than the objective quality of the woman in question. A man who is desperate to get married and have children may propose to the first reasonably qualified woman he comes across, while a man who wants to focus on his career won't be persuaded to propose to any woman regardless of her qualities. In other words, Red Pill recognizes that men are not monoliths. Men, as individuals, have their own agenda that may not be in any way connected to the woman's side of the equation.

When Red Pill fails to extend this same basic understanding to women, her making sexual choices outside of her relationships to men does nothing but breed insecurity and further trap men in their own self-fulfilling prophesy of never getting the kind of love they most crave:

You are the first to explain why women do what women do, but men see sex as the "prize." We would rather be guy 1 than guy 2 who had to wait for sex. In the process of minimizing how she is viewed by society, she is damaging the relationship with the dude she likes. From a guy's point of view, I am just not desirable as guy 1, this is where so-called insecurity stems from because your actions indicate that you would rather pick guy 1 on prowl over me.

Every guy's true fantasy is their woman sticking with them even if they have nothing, we get into a thought loop that 'okay she picked me because of my job, and security, not because of who I am. What if my investment and job goes away tomorrow? Will she stick with me? No, she will now pick the guy 1 because we are not hot like him, he doesn't have to do anything, he just exists.' Whereas most men had to prove with their stable job & commitment to have sex, we are just protecting ourselves (at least me) more than judging a high n-count [bodycount] **women because if tomorrow I lose my stable career and investment I am not sure if my wife will love me the same.**

A man who finds himself in this situation isn't sure exactly what it is he brings to the relationship. He doesn't know how he

“paid” for it, and assumes that since other men “paid” a lesser price and he sees that price as being attractive and just existing, this man must conclude that it’s his productivity and provisioning that “paid” for his relationship. If women are only driven to have sex for alpha-seed beta-need reasons, then for this man, the fact that his partner had sex in the past quickly with other men is proof that she isn’t really attracted to him, and so only values him for the transaction. He can’t help but wonder if she will bother to stick around if he can’t uphold his side of the bargain. A woman in this situation with her partner responding like this is gripped with her own insecurity—if he's pissed about having to “work harder” for her sexuality, then is he even interested in the other 99% of her, or is who she is as a person just tolerable enough to put up with so long as he gets the 1%? Did she not vet him sufficiently? Does he even want her, or would any willing vagina be sufficient? If someone who is less “work” or whose 99% is more “tolerable” comes around, will he leave?

For many women, her reality is that once she has sex with an un-vetted man, the potential havoc he could wreck in her world far outweighs any potential reward he might offer later down the line. Contrary to Red Pill’s insistence that AWALT, women are not a monolith. Just like men, women have goals and dreams and things they want to accomplish. Particularly in the case of the young women most often targeted by Red Pill, some women simply are not ready for commitment and long-term relationships at certain points in their lives. If we accept that women are sovereign sexual beings all in their own right and are not simply being overcome (or not) by the men around her, then we can start to understand how a woman may favor “short-term men” over “long-term men” even while stating that the long-term men are the objectively better men. When we accept the idea that women are people and have other priorities in their lives beyond fulfilling their evolutionary impulses, it’s possible to understand how a woman might favor a fickle “alpha” who she knows won’t stick around for her.

The common Red Pill answer to unknot the evolutionary biological problems of women who require provisioning making a habit of having sex with men who refuse to provide provisioning, is to claim that women believe they are uniquely capable of securing an “alpha” after she’s had sex with him. In other words—Red Pill believes that women confuse sexual interest with romantic interest. Red Pill believes that if a woman has sex with a man, this is prima facie proof that she sees him as high-value and would be willing to be in a relationship with him if he were only to make the offer. Red Pill men legitimately believe that a woman who’d had a one-night stand with an “alpha” would be thrilled if that man called her up and asked her

to be his girlfriend. After all—why wouldn't she want to secure the highest-quality man she could? That would satisfy both sides of her hypergamy! Obviously she thinks the alpha is high quality, because she slept with him so quickly.

The comedian Ali Wong succinctly summarized this: "Everybody knows the secret now that when a woman sleeps with a man right away, it's not because we don't respect ourselves. It's because we don't respect you. We don't see you as marriage material. That's why we let your dick inside so fast. By letting you in, we are really kicking you out of our future."

Alpha-seed beta-need is real: but it's a cognitive strategy, not an innate biological one. It's about choice, not genes. Red Pill fails to recognize that women have the same ability to intellectualize the consequences of their sexual behavior as men do. For instance, Red Pill teaches men that they are expected to use condoms. This is for the common-sense reason of preventing unwanted pregnancy and protecting themselves from contracting unwanted STDs. Not using a condom is seen as downright idiotic and irresponsible. However—men's genes don't want them to use condoms. Men's genes specifically requested the opposite of preventing pregnancy. Yet, men are expected to rather easily override this biological impulse. It's common sense—yes, biologically men are driven to father children… but actually doing so has consequences that an individual man may not want to deal with, and so of course he can intellectualize this and easily make choices to override what his genes are telling him to do.

Red Pill objectifies and dehumanizes women when it fails to recognize their same level of ability to modify their sexual strategy. Women's sexual agency is not measured in the manner that Red Pill men tend to evaluate it, and is instead measured by the ability for women to accomplish what that individual woman wishes to accomplish in the domain of sex and relationships.

A woman doesn't choose men who are known to sleep around because she hopes these men are ready for commitment. She chooses these men because she's not ready for commitment.

Maybe she knows why she doesn't want a relationship, or maybe she isn't consciously aware that she's not ready for commitment. It's entirely possible that she is afraid of a man rejecting her and not being able to love her the way she wants to be loved, just like many Red Pill men are. Because her sexual needs are not tied to her emotional needs the way men's are, a woman who doesn't believe that men are able to love her the way she wants to be loved can offer men her 1% to meet her own sexual needs while keeping her 99% safely tucked away, unable to be seen by him and thus unable to be

rejected by him.

Red Pill believes that women cannot love men the way men want to be loved—to be loved for who they are. To be loved for being an in-progress human being who is just trying to figure out this life thing as they go along. But at the same time, there is no room in Red Pill's ideology for women to be a work in progress. There is no room for a woman to not know what she's doing and to just be doing her best and figuring things out as she goes along.

When women call Red Pill men misogynists, it's not because we think the men advocate for taking away our choice or our vote, or because Red Pill men don't want to help women for nothing in return, or because Red Pill men refuse to enable women to revel in promiscuous hookup culture. Women call Red Pill men misogynists because interacting with them requires women, like me right now, to spend all of our time advocating for our own humanity.

Women use height/looks to disqualify men before they learn anything else about them. Short and/or ugly men get no matches on dating sites, and you can look up those statistics yourself. Looks and height are more important for being attractive to women than anything else because without them a man can't even get his foot in the door.

Many Red Pill men, and in particular Black Pill men, believe that women use men's physical attractiveness as a "gateway function" to sex and relationships. What this means is that a woman will look first at a man's attractiveness and his physical SMV as a pass/fail requirement to getting to know him well enough to know if she is interested in dating him or having sex with him.

This mostly seems to be backed up by online dating app data which shows that while men rank women on a pretty standard attractiveness bell curve—most women rank as average and very few rank as either "highly attractive" or "very ugly." However, women on the site ranked 80% of men as "below average" and in most cases, significantly below average (OKCupid).

Like most women, I do not believe that physical attractiveness is as important to women as it is to men. Red Pill likes to respond with this data and say I and other women are just giving the politically correct answer, but once again Red Pill fails to appreciate the totality of the data.

When it comes to actually sending messages, women are far more inclined to reach out to men they deem "significantly less attractive than average" than men are. Two-thirds of all messages sent to women are sent to the top one-third of the most attractive women.

The most attractive women get twenty times the messages as do the average women. However, women's initial messaging behavior is very different and follows the same curve as how they ranked the men—when looking at the median of attractiveness ranked, the most attractive men get about seven times as many messages as the median attractive men. If anything, this data offers support for what women have been trying to tell men for eons: women do not care about physical attractiveness as much as men do, or even as much as men think women do.

But why do women rank men online as below average? There is a concept called the "male gaze" and the "female gaze" which we will hit on briefly here. Most of the time the male gaze is described as men see "bodies," while in the female gaze women see "people." This is a very We're-Better-Than-Stinky-Boys way to frame the idea and I don't like it that much, but the concept itself has merit.

I believe women see a lot more "context" than men do and it's that context that we use primarily to determine attractiveness. So, the way this would work is that if you give a man a close-up picture of a nice set of breasts, he will rate that "body" reasonably similarly to what he would rate the breasts if he saw them in real life on an actual woman.

Dating apps appeal to men for many reasons, not the least of which is that it reduces the sting of rejection. However, they also cater to the male gaze—when 90% of what a man deems "attractive" can be adequately measured from a profile picture, then online dating apps become effective tools to weed out unattractive women. While it is possible for a woman's intelligence, charm, or personality to change her attractiveness ranking, since 90% of a man's equation is based on what can be seen in a profile picture, it will take an exceptional amount of that intelligence, charm, or personality to turn an unattractive woman into an attractive woman, or to turn an attractive woman into an unattractive woman. For men, for the most part, what they see is what they get.

I don't believe women operate in the same way in this regard. If women's "equation" for attractiveness requires more factors than men's, then it makes sense that when women are only given part of that equation (a disembodied picture), they will rank most men as below average. If the "context" is half of the equation, and only half of the equation are things that can be evaluated from a profile picture, then the best a guy can do is 50%. Context is going to be things like how a man carries himself, eye contact, body language, word choice, need for attention, and a million other tiny cues that cannot be garnered from a profile photo.

To test this hypothesis, we can look at speed dating studies. The data is limited, and I'd love to see more of it, but one study of over 500 speed daters offers some interesting results. With just a 4-minute interaction, most men got more than one "yes." The "attractiveness" scores are not separated by gender, but given that they follow a pretty standard bell curve, it's reasonable to assume that women are not dragging down the average in scores given (Fisman, Raymons et al.).

Give women an actual person to evaluate and they can score on a whole equation. Give them a photo, or take away their ability to pick up on context by putting them in a loud, dark, and crowded club, and women can only score on part of the equation. Thus, I am saying that conventional ideas and ideals of attractiveness, which are all based on how men perceive things, are not as important to women.

This could also be compounded by the apparent fact that women do not rank men objectively; women rank men subjectively. We have a really good idea of what an objective, universally attractive Western woman will look like—in her early twenties, conventionally attractive facial features, and slim. Virtually all men, be they twenty, thirty, forty, or fifty years-old, will rank this same woman as "highly attractive."

However, like we saw back when we were discussing at what age men "peak," the way a woman ranks a man is a lot more dependent upon her subjective ideals than a universally recognized objective criteria. A twenty-year-old woman ranks a twenty-three-year-old man as the "most attractive." A thirty-year-old woman favors men who are also thirty-years-old, a forty-year-old woman ranks thirty-eight-year-old men highest, and a fifty-year-old woman ranks forty-six-year-old men as "highly attractive" (Rudder, Christian. p. 42-43).

When men rank women, they are comparing her to universally objective attractiveness criteria. When women rank men, they are basing their assessment on a moving target that is directly connected to the individual woman doing the ranking. Men who fall outside of her individual criteria will be ranked as "below average," even when that same man is ranked higher by different women. A fifty-year-old woman will not find a thirty-year-old man as attractive as her preferred forty-six-year-old man, but to a thirty-year-old woman, that same guy is "highly attractive." Some more data would be needed to explore this theory further, but it's possible that women are not ranking men as a whole the way men are ranking women, and instead are only considering the minority men within her preferred criteria (which so far means age range) as attractive at all, while the majority

of men who inevitably fall outside her individual criteria would be scored as “not attractive” or “below average.”

Of course, this is not enough of an explanation. TikTok abounds with videos of women talking about how eagerly they reject short men. This also needs to be addressed, and I believe we are dealing with selection bias in these scenarios. Every time I see an example of it, the woman is in her early 20s and highly attractive. Often, the examples provided by Red and Black Pill are from women who literally make a living off their beauty via OnlyFans or Instagram.

These are exactly the kinds of women Red Pill targets and places such a high priority on—young, highly attractive women. That’s fine—but when dealing with a specific demographic, you must guard against making generalizations and extrapolating the extremes common in that demographic to the rest of the population. Red Pill (and especially Black Pill) sees these women using physical attraction as a gateway function and then assumes that all women are a monolith—AWALT.

As we have already seen, the sheer volume of male attention that this demographic of women receives is, frankly, suffocating and damn near unreal. I used to be a young and conventionally attractive woman. Attractive enough, anyway—I was once offered a modeling contract. I have some first-hand experience here. These women cannot leave their homes without getting approached. Men of all ages and backgrounds are very, very interested.

I can’t remember the details, but years ago I was reading about a family of commercial watermelon farmers. They had so many watermelons that he and his family would only eat the very center of each melon—the sweetest and juiciest--and discard the rest. For this farmer, that made sense—he can afford to because he has so many melons, so why shouldn’t he have an abundance of only the top 1% of the melons? That doesn’t mean there is something wrong with the rest of the watermelon or that 99.9% of the human population wouldn’t be very happy with the other 99% of the watermelon, but if you’re only looking at the behavior of watermelon farmers, you are going to think the 99% of melons that isn’t the core is gross or something. Ask anyone who isn’t a watermelon farmer and they won’t rank the core so high in importance as the rest of the melon (or, conversely, won’t rank the 99% so low in comparison). A watermelon farmer is going to turn up his nose at a grocery store pre-cut melon bowl. In no way does that mean that All Humans Are Like That—it only means that this small demographic we happen to be trying to impress is like that.

Tack on the fact that most young women don’t really have an idea of what they want in a partner along with the pressing need to

filter quickly, and you're going to get a system that rejects most men on the quickest thing she's able to assess. Just like some men, some women are shallow—that does not mean that all women are shallow.

Feminism has eliminated the Cartel of the Feminine, which used to regulate the sexual marketplace by keeping women's "price" high. Women would shame each other and exclude each other from their group if they began lowering their price and giving sex away too cheaply.

This will be a very brief one, but I see it enough that I need to address it. Just like how the first beta male exploited an opportunity in our Alpha-harem mating strategy model, every social setup and organization is susceptible to some other strategy gaining a foothold because of some small gap in efficiency or optimization. Over time and eons, what usually evolves is a homeostasis, with multiple strategies co-existing in a complex social environment. In many ways, social "ideas" follow the same evolutionary rules as genes, with inferior strategies being pushed to extinction by more successful strategies. However, just like we end up with competing alleles, so also do we end up with competing strategies.

There are no known perfectly sexually monogamous species. The reason for this is that despite the fact that monogamy is a highly beneficial mating strategy, it has gaps and holes that can be easily exploited for those willing to take a risk. Just like with my beta-need beta-need model, women can gain resources she couldn't otherwise get by being sexually non-monogamous, and men can potentially have more offspring by being sexually non-exclusive than he could by being monogamous. All of this is just potential, however—there are potential costs to balance against these rewards. A woman could get caught and lose the provisioning of her primary mate, risking her life and the lives of her children. A man could fail to actually impregnate anyone and so spend his life working just as hard to give temporary provisioning to many women who don't produce him offspring as he would providing for one woman who is almost certain to provide him offspring.

There has never been a "feminine cartel" that kept women in line because its existence would interrupt the natural homeostasis of the strategy ecosystem. Go too far into enforcing monogamy and the rewards of not being monogamous get higher and higher and more and more worth taking the risk. Going through it all requires some math and deeper explanation, so for those interested I will direct you to Richard Dawkin's *The Selfish Gene*, chapter nine, and specifically where he addresses the possible existence of a cartel (p.150-153).

Okay, so how would an average or below-average man hook up with hot women?

Very often I hear Red Pill men lament about how shallow women are—that they only want the best-looking men or the richest men and are just too shallow to consider an average guy who would treasure her and treat her well. They complain that women are not willing to love men the way men want to be loved—for who they are as people.

This is a very valid complaint. I recommend to these men that they learn to love themselves in the way we have defined "love" and to do many of the things Red Pill recommends doing, just with the different foundational understanding that I have laid out in this book. This will allow them to attract the kinds of women who are willing to love them the way they want to be loved.

Not all the time, but a large proportion of the time, I get the reply of "yes, but how specifically can I compete with the Chads and the Alphas to get the attention of the young attractive women, so I can show her that I can love her genuinely and not transactionally?"

Again and again, I hit this wall with Red Pill men where they seem to think that I'm the one who is missing the point.

If a person is willing to love genuinely, and be loved genuinely, but only by people who meet their pre-conceived criteria, then that person is not willing to love genuinely and is only willing to have a transactional relationship. The men who ask me this question are showing their hypocrisy: they want to be loved and accepted for who they are instead of what they can provide, but are unwilling to extend that same courtesy to women. These men are not willing to love idyllically: the love they are willing to offer is conditional upon the woman being young and hot.

If a man wants to have lots of casual sex, then I recommend reading *The Game* or *The Manual* or any number of other pickup-artist books. I also recommend deleting all dating apps, or at least strictly limiting their use since I know no one will actually delete them, and focus on real-world women to maximize their success rate. These tactics have a proven record of attracting the women most likely to have high sociosexuality levels, and women in real life are more likely to give men a shot than women online. But, understand that men will max out at approximately a 2-4% return on investment and so will be facing high levels of rejection. That's okay—that's normal. Also, keep in mind that these types of casual relationships rarely have any staying power—men cannot expect to begin an ongoing friends-with-benefits situation with these techniques, and the relationship is likely

to dissolve as soon as the novelty wears off. Thus, the time commitment required to sustain whatever level of sexual adventures he hopes to have will never decrease. Casual sex is a numbers game.

It's also important for this man to keep in mind that his behavior is actually saying that casual sex isn't what he really wants—what he wants is to be wanted. To be accepted. To have his emotional needs met. Casual sex will satisfy physical needs, but it will not give these Red Pill men what they actually want (Strauss, 2015).

Many Red Pill men see friendships with women as being a "simp," or a man who is taken advantage of by women. This is a man who will do many favors for a woman without her reciprocating, or who will spend a great deal of time acting as her "emotional tampon" and listening to her problems and being emotionally supportive to her without getting anything in return. For the most part, Red Pill does not accept that friendships are possible between men and women. How could they be? Red Pill does not believe that women can love outside of a transaction.

A "simp" would be best described as a man who "puts the pussy on a pedestal." Literally, this is a man with a high level of benevolent sexism who believes women need to be protected and pampered and spoilt by men. Just like Red Pill men believe that by raising their SMV they can "earn" acceptance from women, men with high levels of benevolent sexism believe that by treating women this way they will "earn" acceptance from women.

Ultimately, this is where the advice "act more like a jerk" comes into play. Red Pill regularly gives this advice to "simp" men. It's advice that is actually good—but it doesn't describe the target, only the direction to move towards.

When you are accustomed to acting like a doormat, enforcing healthy boundaries feels like being a jerk. When you have internalized never disagreeing and bending over backwards to serve others, not doing these things feels like being an asshole. These are not jerk-ish or asshole-ish things to do—they are healthy things to do. However, for every man who needs to be told to act more like a jerk, there is another man who needs to be told to tone the asshole-ish-ness behavior down a notch. The better way to advise men would be to describe the target: treat women like actual human beings.

How do you treat women like actual human beings? By treating them with the same standards and boundaries as you treat your friends. Few men would tolerate a prolonged situation where they were their friend's therapist, so why should they tolerate it from a woman? Listening every so often while she vents is fine, and

showing love by being emotionally supportive for a bit is fine, but neither a friendship nor a romantic relationship can be built by one person. If the other person only takes the pieces offered and never finds a way to start building with them by adding their own, then the healthy thing to do is to regulate that person to "transactional relationship status" and keep them around for whatever reasons are mutually beneficial to the both of you. They had their shot to show you what sort of relationship they were willing to offer, and it wasn't the real love you were looking for. By enforcing these sorts of boundaries, you make room in your life for new people who might be willing to love you in the ways you want to be loved.

"Game" is how Red Pill attempts to teach men how to communicate emotional expression, and specifically how to communicate sexual desire. The key to understanding "Game" is to understand that you are not playing a game, but instead you are playing as if it were a game. When you play a game, you are following the rules dictated to you—a formula, a flowchart. Social interaction and the dating market is a complex, organic system. There is no formula. There is no flowchart. You have to get a feel for the organic development within the system. To play as if social interaction and the dating market were a game is to put yourself on the playing field with the intention of exploring and learning the rules as you go. Each conversation teaches you new things—how to better read body language and facial expressions, what kinds of questions get the most engagement, and even how to coax another person into revealing the complex and layered nuances that makes them a unique human being. When you are exploring, the end result doesn't matter. The point is to explore, not to get anywhere. The point is to increase your game skills with every interaction, training for a time when the stakes will be higher. To treat it like a game is to make this process fun.

After you've leveled up with the basic skills and earned some confidence points with friendly interaction, you can attempt to explore the rules of communicating sexual intent—when does that extra beat of eye contact go from not-being-received-well to I-got-a-smile-back? In time, you learn to read the room and get a feel for the organic system.

Paradoxically, when you can start relating to women as people and individuals instead of objects you wish to do the squelchy with, women start to see you as someone who could potentially love them the way they want to be loved, and not as yet another man only interested in her 1%, or as a man who is disposable and not worth emotionally investing in.

Men who are not interested in monogamy, or who are but are

not yet willing or able to be in a relationship, may find the strategy of seeking multiple ongoing friends-with-benefits arrangements to be ideal.

I often hear from Red Pill men that one of the reasons Red Pill makes sense to them is due to past experience, generally along some version of **When I was acting alpha is when my ex and I got together, but as soon as I started acting beta she lost interest**. When pressed for specifics, these men describe "acting beta" as some version of changing the priorities in their lives in order to prioritize their woman's needs and/or "putting the pussy on a pedestal," or treating her like the "queen" he believed she wanted to be treated like.

So let's analyze this. When these men were "acting alpha" they were prioritizing themselves and their own needs. They were engaged in activities and interests they valued. They were showing love to themselves. When they got into a relationship, they stopped prioritizing themselves and almost certainly stopped engaging in these activities and interests, at least to as much to a degree, so that they could prioritize their woman's needs and goals. He showed love to her, but stopped showing love to himself.

He would also start acting "beta" by idolizing her. This is a significant part of how Red Pill frames the concept of "masculine idealism" in that Red Pill believes that men are prone to putting the pussy on a pedestal unless taught not to.

The "putting pussy on a pedestal" as a bad thing is a concept that confuses a lot of men. They see it as a paradox that women respond negatively to being treated so "well" by men. The reason women do not enjoy being put on a pedestal by their partners is because their partners stop treating them like a human being who is just trying to figure out this life thing as she goes along, and instead starts treating her like an idealized version of herself. When men put women on a pedestal, they stop seeing them as normal humans and replace the person she actually is with a fantasy he's imagined and who only exists inside his head. The woman in question was attracted to a man who indicated, through his ability to love himself, that he just might be able to show love to her as well. Instead, he was unable to even see who she was. You cannot have intimacy with a fantasy. In effect, they were in two different relationships—she with the man he used to be, and he with the woman he imagined her to be.

A woman who wants a healthy relationship will recognize this as an unhealthy dynamic and will leave. A woman only interested in a transactional relationship will seek to exploit his weakness of boundaries to get as much as she can for her own benefit. If alpha-

seed beta-need is the correct model, then women should respond well when men put them on a pedestal—after all, she's getting the maximum possible out of the relationship and can sneak off to bang an alpha when she gets horny. If my beta-need beta-need model is correct, then men who offer more egalitarian relationships are who women seek to pair bond with, and they will have built-in psychological preventatives from pair bonding with any transactional "alpha" relationships they enter in to secure resources from. In alpha-seed beta-need, women *should* be happy to find a beta who will dedicate himself to being her servant instead of squandering his productivity on such frivolous things as his own wants and needs. In reality, no one respects men or women who fail to enforce their boundaries, and men and women who do not love themselves have no boundaries to enforce. The real irony here is that if Red Pill is wrong and my model is closer to the truth, then Red Pill men are actively selecting for relationships in which they are regarded as disposable.

Prioritizing your own needs and showing love to yourself is not something to treat as a placeholder until you manage to snag a romantic partner. Enforcing boundaries designed to empower you to show love to yourself is not the same thing as being an emotionally distant asshole, and showing love to a woman is not the same thing as enabling her bad behavior.

How can a man learn to love himself and accept himself as worthy of love?

We have already talked about how loving yourself means treating yourself the way a healthy mother would treat her child—by making sure the child's needs are met.

When we accept ourselves we also accept the parts of ourselves that we've spent a lifetime trying to hide. A healthy parent teaches us how to love ourselves by the time we reach adulthood, but if we did not have a healthy parent, then ultimately the responsibility to love ourselves and meet our own needs is still our responsibility. Just because someone else didn't do their job does not absolve us of the responsibility to do our job—it just makes our job a lot harder to do. If you did not have a healthy parent teach you how to budget your finances, then that is something you will have to work harder to learn —by listening to podcasts, by reading books, or by taking a personal finance course. If you did not have a healthy parent teach you how to prepare healthy meals, then that is something you will have to work harder to learn—by watching Youtube videos, reading blogs, and learning to read nutrition labels. Your lack of knowing how to love yourself may not be your fault, but it is your responsibility.

When we accept ourselves, we also accept the parts we are ashamed of and have spent a lifetime blaming others for. When we accept ourselves, we accept accountability. We accept that we are a human individual and so a being in perpetual motion, and accept accountability and responsibility for the direction of that movement:

> "Sometimes I struggle with impatience. It's caused a lot of problems for me and it's not a part of myself I'm proud of. It's something I'd like to work on, but I'm not sure how to start."
>
> "I have a history of not enforcing my boundaries with women. I worry they will leave unless I give in, but it just ends up with me getting walked over and her losing respect for me. It's frustrating and I'm ashamed of it, but I've read some books and it's something I am working on."
>
> **"I'm trying to face my fears head on. Not make accusations with new people I'm dating and ultimately enjoy myself. But the thought of "what if" is always in the back of my mind. I feel like I've been conditioned to never trust again, and honestly it upsets me deeply because I've ruined genuine connections with women in the past due to it. I'm currently speaking to a girl who seems genuinely lovely, and I don't want to mess it up due to this fucked up conditioning that I openly made the decision to guide my dating life."**

These are the sorts of things you say to others when you are attempting to lead with vulnerability and openness—when you are leading with love instead of transaction. Accepting that you are worthy of love just as you are means respecting that you are a living being, perpetually in motion, just like every other human being out there. Those who say "I'm worthy of love just the way I am so that means I shouldn't have to do anything," or "this is just the way I am and I'll never be able to fix it and I'll never be able to change," and use this as an excuse to not show love to themselves by doing the acts of love needed to show love to themselves are acting with arrogance—they are saying their journey is done. They are saying there is nowhere else to move. They may be accepting themselves, but they are not empowering themselves.

Your journey is never done. No human can stop moving, even if they wanted to. If a person makes the decision to sit in front of the TV and play video games all day while eating junk food, that person is moving towards a sedentary lifestyle and an unhealthy body. We move towards the world we choose to create. Loving yourself means empowering yourself to direct your inevitable movement towards

healthy and positive things. Either way, your journey isn't over until you are dead, and depending on your personal beliefs, maybe not even then.

There can never be a time where you say "now I am finally worthy" because there is no end—there is just the journey, what you chose to do on it, and who you chose to share it with. There is no value hierarchy in love—since it can only be given, it cannot be earned. All are born worthy, but not all grow to be willing.

It's okay to not be "done." It's okay to have faults and to stumble and to make mistakes, and it's okay to be rejected. Each rejection is, in a way, a gift—this person is telling you that they are not willing to love you the way you wish to be loved, and so you now have the opportunity to remove this person from your life and make room for someone else who just might be willing.

Offering vulnerability is a scary prospect. Some people will not be ready for your vulnerability. They will punish you and judge you when you reveal things about yourself. They will leave.

By never taking that risk, you never give yourself the opportunity to make room in your life for the people who will accept you for who you are. Individuals who will love you the way you want to be loved (be they lovers or be they friends) will not respond with judgement or jokes. They may not know how to respond if this sort of relationship was never modeled for them, but they will try to be supportive and understanding. They will extend you the same courtesy of trying to understand what you say that you have been practicing with others when you offer friendship. Some may respond by sharing something vulnerable about themselves, but most will simply be present and give you space to share. The people you want to make space for in your life are the people who will listen and not make you feel worse for having shared.

And then, one way or another, you will know if they will reject you or not. And you won't have to be afraid anymore.

> **One sentence helped me when I found out that my very first love and very first everything (including first hug --- coming from a conservative upbringing), cheated on me after several years of relationship. That sentence was an answer to my question, "how can I trust a partner again so fully, without the fear of being cheated on again?"**
>
> **A friend replied like this; "by making yourself as happy and strong as possible as a single person. So that you know that you will be fine if abandonment happens again." And I really did not date, going into celibacy,**

working on myself until I really am that strong person. And now I am in a happy relationship and fully trust my partner again. My now partner, she had done the same work too. We love each other so much and trust each other, but we know that we are going to be fine if one of us does the unthinkable.

Here is a reality though. Red pill and other stuff tries to give you the illusion of control, but the truth is, you can't ever 100% know the future. Life is full of risks. You just have to make good choices and work towards good ends and hope for the best for yourself and the people around you.

You don't really trust other people like placing a bet. You trust yourself. You trust that you can rely on your own judgement of someone's character and intentions. You trust that you can rely on your own boundaries and self-preservation instinct to not put up with someone treating you like garbage. You trust that you can do hard things and go through bad experiences and bounce back from them because you are a whole, complete person. If you get to that place, you don't have to police other people's behavior, not that it would work if you tried.

Whether you chose to offer love or you chose not to—that is your choice. One way is safe, but offers no rewards. The other way is risky, but has the potential to reward you with exactly what you most want. Either way, you will move, and you will move towards the world you chose to create.

Hypocrisy, Frame, and why Red Pill is like the Banking Industry

Do you believe in fate, Neo?

- Morpheus

No.

- Neo

Why not?

- Morpheus

Because I don't like the idea that I'm not in control of my life.

- Neo 'The Matrix' (1999)

During the 2007-2010 subprime mortgage crisis, an interesting conversation started occurring in the United States regarding who was to blame for it. The cause of the crisis was the collective failure of many, many homeowners to repay loans they willingly signed up for… but was there more going on than simply large numbers of financially irresponsible people?

For years, American banks authorized sub-prime loans, knowing that their customers could not afford them. These sub-prime loans were not made to people who were doing well financially and then, at some point after they took out the loan, fell on economic hard times. These were people already struggling financially. This is why the banks called them "sub-prime loans," because they were high risk for default and the banks knew these customers probably couldn't pay them back. The banks did this in order to pad their numbers and get more money and prestige from investors. For many years prior to the crisis, the housing market was strong, so when the customers defaulted on their loans, the banks could still recoup their investment through repossessing and then selling the house. If their customers paid back the loan or defaulted, the banks still came out ahead. Meanwhile, the defaulted mortgage would cause the bank's customers to go bankrupt and ruin their credit, putting them in a far worse position than if they'd never purchased a home to begin with.

This posed an ethical quandary, because the bank knew better and willfully did it anyway. The banks jeopardized their own community's stability and integrity by handing out loans they knew would eventually bankrupt their customers. The banks knew the mortgages would damage these people by causing them to go bankrupt and destroy their credit, and then the banks went and

approved this scenario so often as to enable a national crisis.

Is the individual home purchaser still responsible for the consequences of agreeing to a damaging loan? Yes, of course—they acted irresponsibly and took out a loan they couldn't afford. But… what about the bank? Do the American banks hold any responsibility for the 2001-2010 subprime mortgage crisis they knowingly helped to bring about?

The consensus is a very strong "yes." Both the irresponsible lendees and lenders moved towards the world they chose to create until it ended up damaging them both and the rest of their community along with them.

One of the main complaints that comes from Red Pill is the damage being done to society today from feminism's influence—specifically hook-up culture as a result of the sexual liberation of women and the resulting rise in children being raised without a father's influence. The standard response Red Pill provides to the question of "how is it not hypocritical for it to be okay for men to have many sexual partners, but not okay for women to have many sexual partners?" is generally some paraphrasing of the following:

> **This is not a double standard because women hold the sexual rights in most species on the planet, including humans. Meaning, they decided who, what, how many partners, what they want to do, etc. Men can't expect sex in any capacity. That's why men aren't held to the same standard. Men have no control over that. Men have sex with who they're allowed to, while women have sex with who they want to.**

This is more or less a rewording of Briffault's law, which we talked about in an earlier chapter: "The female, not the male, determines all the conditions of the animal family. Where the female can derive no benefit from association with the male, no association exists." Red Pill just ignores the larger context and applies the logic to a snapshot in time instead of to the species as a whole.

In other words, Red Pill asserts that men are the opportunistic reactionaries in the sexual marketplace while women are the gatekeepers and thus all actual responsibility for the social consequences of sexual activity belongs squarely on the women's shoulders. If women did not allow men to have sex with them all higgledy-piggledy, then it simply wouldn't happen.

The problem with this explanation is that it assumes men are mindless automatons with no true agency of their own. Red Pill paints men to be like my male goats during breeding season: completely

devoid of any spark of intelligence and likely to spend all their time forgoing sustenance and rest in order to endlessly pace the fence separating them from the females. If my male goat were to find a weakness in the fence and have sex with one of my willing females without my permission, I would consider that to be my fault, not my goat's fault. My goats are not capable of making rational choices at this level. I am in no way convinced that my goats even understand the concept that sex leads to babies. Because they are animals.

When Red Pill denies men's responsibility for their own sexual choices, they also fundamentally deny men's autonomy in making that choice. Earlier, we talked about how Red Pill denies that women possess the ability to intellectualize their sexual activity. Now we find Red Pill does the same for men of their sexual responsibility. Men have the intellectual capability to stop mid-foreplay and put on a condom in order to subvert their base sexual drives, but they apparently do not have the intellectual capability to… give consent? In order to give consent, you need the ability to say "no." By playing into the stereotype that men are just perpetually horny animals who will jump at the opportunity to have sex with anything that moves, Red Pill denies that men can understand or be responsible for the consequences of their sexual behavior. Because biology designed them to be the less picky gender, men somehow have no choice in who they have sex with and only women do?

Red Pill is denying men's very ability to function in an adult environment—after all, if you can't be held responsible for something as basic as where you choose to insert your own body parts, then how on earth can you be capable of providing any sort of meaningful sexual consent? Only women get to have a choice in who they have sex with, but men are biologically obliged to lie back and think of England? When Red Pill makes this argument, they are essentially advocating for men to be treated as children. In modern language, Red Pill is saying men have no business having sex in the first place.

If we stop with that nonsense and start from the assumption that men should rightfully be treated as sovereign adults, then we must understand the concept that each man (and woman) is a member of his or her larger community. Some communities are the result of geography, such as your immediate neighborhood, while others are joined out of a conscious choice, such as the Red Pill community, a book club, or a college campus. No matter what community you are a member of, it is ultimately your responsibility to help shape, preserve, and/or change that community into a community you wish to be a part of. In other words—it's not someone else's problem. It's not the leader's problem, it's not the police's problem, it's not the teacher's

problem, and it's not the other gender's problem to shape your community into something you are proud of. You hold the exact same amount of responsibility as every single other person who is also a member of your community, and to claim you do not is to willfully say you have no more rights, responsibilities, or privileges than a small child or an invalid—that you are less than a fully realized sovereign and capable individual. Claim you are helpless, or accept your adult responsibility—either way, you move towards the world you choose to make.

Red Pill believes that women will be unhappy if they do not find and secure the commitment of a high-value man and bear his children. We've already seen that Red Pill heavily equates a woman's value and ability to become a wife to a high-value man and a mother to high-value children with her bodycount. Red Pill believes that the higher a woman's bodycount, the less chance she has of becoming a fulfilled and happy woman. The higher the number of previous sexual partners she has, the less chance this woman has of securing the things that will ultimately make her happy. Whether you agree with Red Pill or believe as they believe is unimportant to this section. Whether it's true or not is also irrelevant to this section—Red Pill believes it to be true, and that is what is important in this discussion.

If Red Pill men truly believe that hedonism and promiscuous, commitment-free sex damages their own community, then how is it not immoral and irresponsible to have sex with women they are not committed to? Just like with the American banking industry, independent customers may be willfully signing up for the deal, but Red Pill men know they are damaging the women they hook up with and, by extension, damaging their own larger community as a whole.

In all my conversations with Red Pill men, this concept has been the biggest point of contention, bar none. The sheer force of the push-back I receive from Red Pill advocates has been both substantial and consistent. Many times I became convinced that I was missing *something* in my understanding of Red Pill, and so would go back and try to learn again. After many months of searching, I believe I have stumbled upon the reason Red Pill clings so strongly to this belief.

It's a woman's responsibility who she allows inside her body.

That's true, she is. Men are also responsible for where they choose to insert their own body parts. It takes two to tango.

But since we're talking about individual women now, let's consider them in more depth. Red Pill believes that a woman's value is based on her number of sexual partners, and that having more sexual partners damages her and decreases her ability to bond with future

partners and be good wives and mothers. A high bodycount will ultimately keep her from having a full and happy future. Yet, Red Pill advocates having lots of commitment-free sex with women and thus knowingly damaging them and their futures.

I genuinely don't see how men who believe this can avoid the psychological damage of knowing they are permanently harming another human being every time they get laid, be they consciously aware of this dynamic or not. I personally have no issues with responsible, consenting adults doing whatever with other responsible, consenting adults. This is not a pro-abstinence book. I am simply exploring the world through the moral perspective of Red Pill. I don't see how Red Pill can rationalize around the fact that they are using another person for their own selfish gain while knowing it permanently damages that person, and then… saying it's on her for having low standards? I do not see how men who conduct themselves in this way can justify it in a moral way. It feels to me more like a hedonistic way of enjoying the decline of their own community while pushing it along, regardless of the consequences. This is the opposite of what Red Pill claims itself to encourage—being a responsible adult with integrity and taking responsibility for your own actions. If Red Pill believes as Red Pill believes, then what it is instructing men to do is feeding the decline of society while blaming everyone else for the declining of society.

We will talk about this more later in this chapter, but ultimately I see this as an attempt by Red Pill to legitimize their hypocrisy of criticizing promiscuous women for enabling men's own promiscuity. This is the inevitable psychological damage and rational twisting that must be done in order to willfully and knowingly damage another human being for their own personal gain.

You can't hold today's men responsible for the current state of society.

No, but I can hold today's men responsible for their own contributions to today's society. We are all in perpetual motion, and we all move towards the world we choose to create. Communities are like living organisms—feed them, and they will grow. Hookup culture is a community fed by more and more individuals choosing to engage in promiscuous sexual activities. If Red Pill men believe that hookup culture and promiscuous sex is damning our entire society, then how can I not hold them responsible for feeding the monster? For moving toward that world? In other words,

> When Red Pill men lament the lack of women that they believe would make good wives and mothers they blame the feminist "you go girl" attitude towards promiscuity, but does a

> community of men who've dedicated themselves to understanding female psychology so that they can exploit it for promiscuous relationships bear any responsibility for the lack of good wives and mothers they perceive? (Trueheart, Jared).

Who cares if it rationalizes morally? Biology is sexist. Take it up with God. Men have always been this way.

Biology gives us an explanation for the behavior, but that's all it can give us. Biology can tell us how someone died when they didn't get enough oxygen, but biology can't tell us if it's "okay" to execute a criminal by asphyxiation—we need ideology for that.

Humans evolved with the norm to binge on sugary foods when the opportunity arose because sugary foods were rare, perishable, and nutrient-dense (fruit, honey), so it made sense to eat as much as possible while they could. Today that translates into wanting to eat the whole bag of Reeses™ even though you really should lose twenty pounds. Just because we have a very valid biological reason for doing something doesn't mean it's necessarily a good idea to continue with the behavior. We need ideology to tell us if it is a good idea to follow our biological imperative.

It was also a norm that fathers, brothers, and uncles, if they found out that some man had taken liberties with "their" woman—consensual or not—had every right to beat the shit out of the guy who took liberties without commitment. If there was even the slightest question as to how consensual the encounter was (and given the social pressures put on caught women, there often would be), then these men had every social permission to kill the guy in very painful and drawn-out ways. Maybe the legal letter of the law did not give them this ability, but when it came to real-world practice… good luck getting a jury of their peers to convict. Murder has always (more or less) been illegal in human culture, but between 1882 and 1968 there were well over 4,000 lynchings of white and black Americans in the southern United States, and this number is likely highly under reported (NAACP). These were not simple hangings without due process. They often involved the victim being beaten, tortured, humiliated, and even burned to death. The most common reason given for a lynching was murder, but the second was rape or sexual assault —usually inflated charges of more minor violations of Jim Crow laws, or farces designed to punish white victims for sympathizing with the civil rights of black Americans.

If you think these lynching mobs feared being held legally responsible for these crimes, then you would be wrong. Lynching, as a

social tool, was not used simply to punish one individual for that individual's crime. Just like the officially sanctioned order to rape an innocent woman from all the way back in chapter one, the purpose of lynching was to put fear into an entire demographic of people to keep them "in their place." That place, specifically, being lower in the social hierarchy than the ones doling out the punishment. Keeping a rival tribe in check has very sound biological reasoning—if they've got an equal share of the pie, then your slice is less than it was before. Now your chance of surviving and thriving is lower than it was before the equality happened. Equality is very bad when you're the one with the larger chunk of pie.

By that same rationale, beating or killing men who slept around with the women the mob is related to also has a sound biological basis. It's not just a person's children who carry copies of a person's genes—that woman possesses similar DNA as the mob, and if she is unable to care for her children because the sperm donor up and left, then that puts her relative's DNA legacy at risk. Not as many copies of these men's genes are going to survive to make more copies. Not only is this mob keeping the cad from coming back and potentially impregnating and abandoning more of their women, but the male relatives are also sending a message to any other potential cads that this behavior will not be tolerated, thus likely preventing future problems.

So, by holding fast to the biological justification that women are supposed to be the gatekeepers of sex and thus men hold no responsibility for the social consequences of non-commitment sex, then Red Pill must also believe that the women's overly aggressive and territorial male relatives have every right to beat them (the cad) and maybe even kill them without legal or social recourse. After all, those men are just following their biological imperatives too. Otherwise, Red Pill is just trying to have their cake and say the calories don't count. Otherwise, they're just promoting narcissistic hedonism and not personal responsibility.

By not acknowledging and addressing this hypocrisy, Red Pill encourages men to act without integrity or respectability. Red Pill preaches the doom that the monster of promiscuity will bring while actively feeding that monster. The men present themselves as children, then demand adult privileges.

It is each individual's responsibility to model the types of communities and relationships that they want, and then to filter out those individuals not willing to meet them at that level. It is not the actions of an adult to wait around for someone else to fix things to your liking. It's certainly not the actions of an adult to expect someone

else to clean up your mess.

I will take a brief break here and clarify that a surprisingly high percentage of Red Pill men I've spoken with hold conflicting beliefs on these points. As much as they push back against it being morally unjustified to engage in promiscuous behavior with women while simultaneously holding the belief that women are damaged by promiscuous behavior, they are very often unwilling to actually engage in promiscuous activity themselves. In other words, they personally feel that a promiscuous lifestyle conflicts with their own morality or mental well-being. From my very unscientific survey, I'd estimate this group could be as large as a small majority of the mainstream Red Pill community. Because they believe in Red Pill's ideology, they believe, at least intellectually, that a promiscuous lifestyle for men is a correct and ideal one, and defend it as such. I want to make it abundantly clear that this last chapter is not an attack on Red Pill men themselves—it is an attempt to expose the ideology of Red Pill. Most Red Pill men, from what I can tell, struggle with reconciling their own instincts with Red Pill's taught masculine ideal just as much as I have. These men feel conflicted by this, and have wondered aloud to me if their unwillingness to casually sleep around meant they were doomed to always be a loser beta.

Just like women, Red Pill men are not a monolith. Many of them have a strong gut instinct that engaging in these actions while holding these beliefs is *not right*, even if they can't intellectually explain this cognitive dissonance.

Other Red Pill advocates will die on this hill. They will give no ground. The most adamant, zealous, and verbally violent Red Pill men I have encountered drew the line with me here.

So men should abandon their sexual strategy just to accommodate women better? Pushing more responsibility because women can't make better choices in their sexual partners?

Believe it or not, I legitimately have no problem with men trying to get laid more. I really don't. However, I also don't believe that a woman's intrinsic value is connected to her bodycount, and I don't believe that women's sexual liberation and feminism are the reasons why fatherlessness is on the rise. This is why it's possible for me to not be a hypocrite when I say I don't have a problem with men (or women) trying to have more sex. The problem arises when individuals, like Red Pill men, hold these Red Pill beliefs and engage in this Red Pill behavior.

Communities are like living organisms: feed them and they will grow. Vegetarians believe that current factory farming practices are immoral and will doom the planet, so they choose not to feed the meat industry and instead feed food industries more in line with their beliefs and goals. Because they feed a community of non-meat-eaters, their community has grown and developed all sorts of faux-meats and other convenient alternatives. They are moving towards a world they have chosen to create. Ultimately, it hasn't stopped the world from eating meat, but vegetarians themselves have not been part of what they see as the problem. Their conscious is clear, as it were. I'm a meat-eater and while I see their point, I ultimately do not agree with them. Nevertheless, I can deeply respect vegetarians for walking the walk and matching their words to their actions. While their values do not line up with my own, I recognize them as acting with integrity.

If an individual man decided that his society was beyond saving and decided he may as well enjoy what's left and ride the downfall, then I suppose that's his business, but he's not a man who is practicing personal responsibility. He's a man engaging in nihilistic hedonism. At least he's not a hypocrite, though, because he doesn't think there is anything worth saving.

Red Pill has a fuzzy, but reasonably succinct roadmap for getting society back on track: end fatherlessness and bring back both the responsible masculine and responsible feminine. It's a great goal, and arguably an achievable one rooted in the concept of personal responsibility. Red Pill acknowledges that these responsible, masculine men and responsible, feminine women do exist, if they are rare, and that if we had more of them, then more children would be raised with strong father figures. Red Pill then goes on and instructs men to indulge in narcissistic hedonism as if there was nothing worth saving or growing. By doing so, these Red Pill men actively select against the types of women who are inclined towards social responsibility and commitment. Red Pill basically says "yes, these women we all want and dream about do exist, but it would be such a bother to find them that it's not worth it. Best to cater to the multitude of women we really don't want as much. Getting lots of what you don't want is almost as good as getting a small amount of what you actually want."

While I don't agree with the vegetarian, I do respect them for their integrity. If someone proclaimed the same things as many vegetarians do—that meat is murder and the factory farms are killing the planet—and then that person went and hosted BBQs while chowing down on Walmart red meat burgers because veggie burgers are "inconvenient," then that person is not acting with integrity. I can respect the vegetarian who does not eat meat even when I don't agree

with their reasoning for not eating meat, but how can I or anyone else respect Red Pill for demonizing the very monster they actively feed and nurture? Red Pill instructs men to engage with and grow a culture of narcissistic hedonism that Red Pill believes is killing our society, and then Red Pill blames the damage exclusively on women for agreeing to sleep with them. This is what Red Pill calls having personal responsibility. It's the same argument the banks used to deflect their own share of the responsibility for the sub-prime mortgage crisis. It is blatant hypocrisy and chauvinism.

Literally, the only way to rationalize around this is to deduce that women do not qualify as "people." Only when women are "property" and not truly human can they no longer be considered part of a man's community, and this moral conundrum goes away. If women are property, then only when a woman is "owned" can her value really be reduced by having sex with her—if no one claims the abandoned building, then can you really "reduce its value" by knocking out a few windows? For much of Western history, this was how things worked. The foundation of Red Pill sets the stage for modern men to embrace the ideology of women as property once again.

When Red Pill teaches that women's value is based on their bodycount and then encourages its followers to raise women's bodycounts, Red Pill is not teaching personal responsibility. Red Pill is acting as a wartime General, pressuring his men into acts of atrocity in order to bind them by guilt so that the men's fate is tied to his own. Only by dehumanizing and/or demonizing the "enemy" can these acts of atrocity be rationalized. Historically speaking, there is no easier way to guarantee diehard loyalty from a group of otherwise reluctant men than by implicating them in shared crimes.

A man must always hold Frame. His woman needs to enter his Frame and he should never enter hers.

Frame is the concept of worldview. It is psychological muscle and puts yourself as the mental point of origin of your world. Frame is making yourself the protagonist in your own life story. If "game" is mostly referring to PUA techniques on how to attract women, then Frame is "inner-game." Most people would call it "confidence." Frame is about knowing who you are, what is important to you, and what you want out of life. Frame influences things like religious beliefs, political affiliations, beliefs in gender dynamics, and just in general the principles of how you choose to live your life. Someone with a weak Frame is easily dominated and manipulated by stronger Frames. "Holding Frame" is focusing on your beliefs and your own happiness.

A person with a strong frame will believe "I am good enough."

According to Red Pill teachings, within the context of a romantic relationship, you can either be in the man's Frame, or in the woman's Frame. Whoever's Frame is stronger will be the dominate person in the relationship and will be the de facto leader.

An example of "Holding Frame" according to Red Pill is illustrated in the conversation below, taken from a Red Pill subreddit. In this conversation, a couple in a romantic sexual relationship are discussing her desire to travel overseas for six months and work as an au pair:

Boyfriend: "I forbid you to go."

Girlfriend: "You never forbid me anything and you can't do that."

Boyfriend: "I will not have a long distance relationship. If you go, we're done."

Girlfriend: "What are you talking about? Why not? You could fly over for a few weekends, I could show you around a different country, and we'd be able to see each other while I'm away."

Boyfriend: "You want to go—have fun. But I'm not going to have a long distance relationship. If you go, we're done."

Girlfriend: "It sucks that you are going to throw away our entire relationship just because I'm going abroad."

Boyfriend: "I don't care."

Girlfriend: "But I will regret not taking this opportunity for the rest of my life if I don't go, and I know I'll regret it if we break up. There has to be a way to make this work."

Boyfriend: "You're just going to have to live with some regret."

We are told that the girlfriend decided to not travel abroad.

This is a textbook example of "Holding Frame" according to Red Pill: the man did not compromise, did not cave in, he did not offer to visit her once a month. He stuck to his opinion until it became her opinion. Whether this conversation ever actually happened or was fabricated is unimportant. The subtext is that he is not afraid to lose her—he needs her less than she needs him, which makes him the more powerful member of the couple. She submitted to him and is now living within his Frame. Holding Frame is very much about sticking to your guns and, especially when dealing with women as sexual

partners, maintaining a “my way or the highway” mentality.

The men of Red Pill develop a stronger Frame by fostering an “abundance mentality.” Abundance mentality is the opposite of “scarcity mindset.” Scarcity mindset, in this context, is the belief that there are not many women who will find a man attractive and so he needs to do whatever he can to keep a woman who is interested around, lest he end up alone for a long time before the next rare unicorn comes about. A man with an abundance mentality believe that there are many women who find him attractive, so it’s not that big of a deal if his woman leaves him because there are plenty of other fish in the sea.

Another common example used in the Red Pill community to illustrate this concept is a man who has a side gig that pays him more than his 9-5 job. This man holds Frame over his boss, because it’s not a big deal if this man loses his 9-5 job. This man is practicing abundance mentality and is unlikely to be taken advantage of by his boss. A man without a lucrative side gig won’t be able to tell his boss that he’s already busy with a previously assigned project when his boss tries to load on more work. This man will say “I’ll take care of it,” feel unappreciated, and have to deal with stress and staying late to complete his work because he is always going to be in his boss’ Frame. This man needs his 9-5 job more than his boss needs him to do the 9-5 job. The man living in his boss’s Frame, putting himself last, and is vulnerable to being exploited by his boss.

Frame, according to Red Pill teachings, is about your perception of reality and therefore Frame is reality. Entering someone else’s Frame is to evaluate objective reality by their assessment. The girlfriend above is in her boyfriend’s frame because she has evaluated that her relationship with him is more important than her desire to go abroad. The man with the side gig has a boss that will not exploit him. The man with a weak Frame will walk into a club thinking “I hope I will get to meet a beautiful woman tonight and that she will like me,” while a man with a strong Frame walking into a club has the mentality “I am alpha gem in this beta world. Women will feel honored and thrilled at the opportunity to meet me.”

Frame, as best as I’ve been able to deduce, is how Red Pill is trying to teach men how to love themselves and maintain healthy boundaries. There is a lot of good to take away from the concept of Frame. But, unfortunately, Red Pill goes too far with it and instead of using Frame as a way to instruct men how to love themselves, it teaches men to act like narcissists.

Much of the concept of Frame has to do with choice, and specifically the choice an individual has in responding to any given

situation. For the most part, we have little control over our outside environment, but we always have a choice in how we respond to it. Both Red Pill and I agree on this, but then Red Pill has to go and make it an all-or-nothing thing.

According to Red Pill, whoever's Frame is strongest and held the longest is the person who will "win" in the relationship. Remember—Red Pill staunchly believes that the only kind of relationship that can exist between men and women is a transactional one, and so Red Pill advocates men look after their own interests and be the one "winning" that transaction. **A woman needs to love her man more than he loves her, or he will end up entering her Frame and she will control the relationship.** A man should "need" the woman less than the woman needs him, so that the power imbalance is always in his favor.

This is not entirely terrible advice.

I own a herd of miniature dairy goats and I have a deep affection for them, both individually and as a herd, but it's not the sort of love you would give to a romantic partner, and I'm not just talking about the obvious bestiality issues. I enjoy spending time with my goats and cuddling with my goats and spoiling my goats with treats. In various ways my goats give me status in the world of people who actually care about miniature dairy goats in much the same way that prize horses gives their owner's status in the horse world. I make sure that my goats are healthy, are fed correctly, are bred when appropriate, and have everything they need to thrive. My goats are very happy. However, the affection I feel for my goats is not love in the way that I love the people in my life. My goats get no real say in their lives and so any accomplishments or credentials they have are not truly their own—they are mine. I cannot trust my goats to manage their own diet because they will overeat and get fat and unhealthy. I cannot trust them to manage their own foraging territory because they will run out into the road and get hit by a car. I cannot trust them to manage their own breeding schedule because I know they will breed at a time of the year that causes them to go into labor and give birth to wet, helpless kids when it's freezing outside, or be heavily pregnant with multiples when it's over 100°F. I choose which of their kids to retain and which to sell and they don't get a say in that decision. I choose when to bring a new goat into the herd, which will change all the social dynamics, and they do not get a say.

Even with the language barrier, I pay very close attention to their preferences and my goats influence me on what types of feed they prefer, what type of vegetables I grow for them as treats, and if their sleeping arrangements need to be adjusted due to internal herd

conflicts. I want them to be happy and I'm willing to go the extra mile to make that happen. Despite the limitations I impose on them, I genuinely believe that any goat would be thrilled to be chosen by me and get to live in my barn and be taken care of by me. My goats live in a gilded cage and I always hold my Frame. This is a very healthy relationship for me to have with my herd, and it is a transactional one where I'm the leader. Ultimately, it is mutually beneficial—all of my goats' needs are met and they are met better than the goats could meet them on their own. Everyone wins.

Back to our definition of what love is—love is not an emotion, love is actions. You don't love yourself by looking in the mirror and chanting "I am worthy" until you feel it. You love yourself by respecting yourself enough to nourish yourself with healthy foods, by maintaining a healthy weight, by making sleep and exercise a priority, and by working your mind and body with regular challenges and new learning experiences. You show love to yourself by being responsible with your future security by having a budget and by keeping up on your responsibilities. You love yourself by maintaining healthy friendships and letting toxic ones go. You love yourself by respecting yourself enough to enforce boundaries with those around you so they can't impede you from taking care of your own needs in this way.

Are you showing love to yourself if you allow your partner to walk all over you and capitalize your time? Are you loving yourself if you consistently drop whatever you are doing to solve whatever problem they need your help with, causing you to lapse on your own responsibilities? Frame, in this context of how to love yourself, is how you keep others from infringing upon your boundaries so that you are able to keep loving yourself.

So let's talk about healthy boundaries—what they are and what they are not.

Picture boundaries as actual physical boundaries, like a backyard. Ultimately, every adult is their own sovereign human being with their own yard. I do not have the right to tell someone else what they can or cannot do on their own property. I don't even have the right to tell my husband that he is not allowed to have sexual relationships with other women—however, I have every right in the world to say "if you have sex with other people, then I will not come over to your yard, and you will not be invited over to mine." Alternatively, someone in a different kind of relationship might have the boundary of "I'm not willing to be monogamous. If we are going to spend time in each other's yards, then that needs to be understood and everyone needs to be okay with that."

These are healthy boundaries. People who respect each other

respect each other's boundaries. If your friend is trying to quit smoking, then he doesn't have the right to tell you to stop smoking too. But, he does have the right to say "I can't be around people who are actively smoking." If you respect your friend, then you would then choose to abstain from smoking while you are spending time with your friend. You are voluntarily abiding by their boundaries—their yard.

If you continued to be in a relationship with your partner or your friend after they make it clear, through their actions, that they do not respect your boundaries, then what is really being said is that they don't respect you or your needs. They are not showing you love. If you continue to associate with them and respect their boundaries, then you are showing them love, but you are not loving yourself because you are not maintaining the boundaries you need to be able to meet your own needs and give love to yourself. A partner who cheats on you is hindering your ability to meet your need for emotional stability and potentially putting your health at risk. A friend who won't stop smoking around you when you are trying to quit is preventing you from avoiding temptation when you most need to avoid relapsing into bad habits.

A healthy parent loves their child in this way and teaches that child to love themselves by the time that child is an adult. It is important to love yourself first—before you attempt to love others—because we are capable of loving others without loving ourselves. When we learn to love ourselves, we learn to enforce healthy boundaries that keep us from being taken advantage of by those who want to receive love, but are unwilling to give it back. The dynamics of the one-way loving relationship between a parent and a child is no longer healthy once that child reaches adulthood.

The child must learn to love themselves, or be doomed to a life where they never receive love from anyone. It is possible to love others without loving ourselves, but almost impossible to receive love without loving ourselves. So when I say that Red Pill isn't giving entirely bad advice, what I'm saying is that I agree that a healthy man should not "need" his woman. In no way does that mean I believe that his woman should "need" him. Healthy adults are not completed by being in a relationship—they do not need to be with someone to be fulfilled.

Love between adults is selfless. Love is built upon a foundation of mutual vulnerability, of trust that comes after the other has consistently not betrayed that vulnerability, and of mutual respect formed from the reciprocity of that shared vulnerability and trust. Without trust and respect, love cannot exist. Affection can exist

without trust or respect, but not love. There is a huge difference between love and affection or possession. There is a difference between love and lust or infatuation. Controlling someone, or someone being a status symbol for you, or someone who exists just to serve you, is not love. That's a trophy. It's possession. In the best of circumstances, it's a mutually beneficial transaction.

Healthy boundaries exist to allow you to continue to meet your own needs and love yourself. They are not for getting your own way all the time. Having a boundary of not staying out late when you have work or school the next day is a healthy boundary, because taking care of your own needs and responsibilities requires you to perform and be alert at your job or in class. You are free to tell your friend that you think it's a bad idea for them to stay out late, but ultimately it's their decision. They don't have any more right to keep you out late than you have to force them home early.

On the flip side, if you had a tone-deaf friend who fantasized about being a rock star and was offered a random gig at some venue, would you insist he not get up on stage and embarrass himself, or would you end up going to the gig and cheering him on, regardless? A friend tells their buddy that it's a bad idea, and then that same friend supports their buddy anyway. Holding Frame means insisting your friend not go and refusing to participate in something you think is a terrible idea, but there is nothing about entering your friend's Frame in this case that would prevent you from meeting your own needs. Friends willingly and happily enter each other's Frame in order to support each other and show each other love. Friends enter each other's Frame just for the joy of doing so. No matter how terrible their friend is on stage, a loving friend gives a standing ovation.

Frame, as Red Pill describes it, is about boundaries, but it is also about control. Control is when you want your partner to fit a mold that suites your needs. Love between partners is not control, because control leaves no room for trust. How can you respect someone you don't trust? Right now, Hubby and I have very traditional gender roles—he works a 9-5 and I'm a stay-at-home mom. His job is to earn money and benefits and my job is to keep the kids alive, feed everybody, and maintain a minimum level of order in the house. This has not always been our roles. When we first married, I earned significantly more than he did. Even as a stay-at-home mom, there is the occasional year where my side-gigs do very well and I earn more. There have been times my health was so bad that he had to be the primary parent and care for me, too. Before I was forced to retire, the plan was for Hubby to be the stay-at-home parent. Yet the dynamics of our relationship have never changed because our

dynamics are not dependent on what roles we fill for each other.

Contrary to many Red Pill men's assurances that my relationship cannot possibly be the norm, power relationship researchers who have studied intact, untroubled families conclude that it's nearly impossible to determine whether it was the husband or wife who wielded more power. Most healthy married couples spend most of their time pursuing joint goals where their interests converge and no conflict of wills is involved. When issues come up where the partners differ, each is able to effectively influence the other, albeit with different techniques (Broderick, C.B.).

Red Pill teaches men who chose to be in relationships to be good stewards and leaders of their families. To be strong and to set the standard. Red Pill believes that through holding Frame, a man can offer his woman and family the best standard of living and the most comfort and security. The ideal Red Pill man is expected to cherish their wives and families and to work hard to provide the best for them. It really is a lovely image.

Here is the problem: love is not imagining the best, most wonderful future you can for your partner and then pushing them towards it. Love is accepting that others have the wisdom and intelligence to imagine their own path, and then, no matter how differently their imaginings look from yours, asking your partner what you can do to help them achieve their goals. Loving is doing this for your partner. Being loved is when your partner does this for you. Together with mutual respect, trust, and commitment, you build a life together that reflects both of your imaginings. I never wanted kids, and Hubby never wanted a homestead. Now we have kids on a homestead and they complement each other in ways neither of us ever pictured. We are in each other's Frames, and while we still have boundaries with separate metaphorical yards, we visit each other often. He isn't always coming to my yard, and I'm not always going over to his. This is love.

Love is benevolent and kind and giving and dependable and cares what other's wants, needs, and dreams are. So often we get into unhealthy relationships because we believe this person wants to be with us and builds us up by saying how wonderful and beautiful we are, but if they are not willing to give and to sacrifice for us, then it's not love. It can be attachment, it can be affection, and it can certainly be lust, but ultimately if the reason they want to be with us is because it raises their status or because we fit a list of pre-determined requirements to meet their needs and wants, then it's not love. It's using another to further your goals. It's possession. People who love each other are willing to sacrifice for each other—freely, as an act of

love. When one partner is required to change or to get in line out of fear of the other not being happy or leaving, when one person is required to always visit the other's yard and never the other way around, that is called codependence.

Having boundaries is not narcissism—it is personal responsibility. Narcissism is when those around you are not other people who are on their own life journey, but instead a means for you to meet more of your wants and needs. Narcissists do not respect that others have their own wants and needs, and all they see is what others can do for them.

Love between adults goes both ways—not just the one-way sacrifice that women are expected to make for men in the Red Pill community. When two people truly love each other, they sacrifice and work to make each partner's dreams come true. Love is action. Love is helping others to meet their needs, and loving yourself is making sure your own needs are met. Loving yourself means having boundaries that protect your own ability to meet your needs.

Control is not love, because control leaves no room for trust and love without trust is not love at all. Love is trusting that other people feel and know and can imagine their own destiny, and then support them in taking ownership to move towards a world they choose to create. Love is respecting what others feel and know and imagine, and believing the unseen order they have for their lives is just as valid as the unseen order you have for yours is.

The model of a boss/employee or Captain/First Mate relationship is often used to describe the ideal Red Pill marriage, where the woman is expected to advise the man and offer suggestions, and the man is expected to value the woman's council. However, under no circumstances is a Red Pill man to enter a woman's Frame and allow her to become the leader or make important decisions. Red Pill men insist women cannot be trusted to not follow the demands of their hypergamous nature, and so they conclude that women must be controlled if a man is to commit to her.

Usually at this point I have Red Pill men stop me and say that nowhere in Red Pill teachings does it state that men must control women. They're right—this isn't explicitly spelled out. It would probably upset a lot of potential Red Pill men if it were. But what else is insisting a woman always be in a man's Frame if not a type of control? His way or the highway. She may technically have the freedom to leave, but the only way he will permit her to interact with him is when he's the one in control and she is the one submitting to him. He is actively selecting for women who do not love themselves and have no boundaries to maintain. Red Pill's very belief system is

predicated upon women not loving themselves or having healthy boundaries. Red Pill's belief system is based on these easily controlled women being "normal."

An ideal Red Pill man will not allow his woman to travel abroad without him, lest she succumb to her hypergamy when away from his influence. By the same token, many Red Pill men will not permit their women to go on a "girl's night out" for the same reason. Since a woman's nature is hypergamy and she is not believed to have the ability to intellectualize her sexual activity the way men can, it is up to the Red Pill man to recognize her natural limitations and control her environment.

What boundary is a Red Pill man enforcing when he does not allow his woman to take a trip overseas? Or go out on a girl's night? What need of his is he protecting his ability to meet? Frame in this context is about control, about knowing the equation that is a woman and needing to control the end result of her hypergamous mathematics. This is not love.

The devil is in the details. I freely praise Red Pill for telling men to get off their lazy asses and go make something of themselves, just like I praise feminism for telling women to get off their lazy asses and to go make something of themselves. My problem with Red Pill relationship dynamics is that the woman is expected to make sacrifices for her man, to continuously fit into his Frame, to show humility and to meet his needs, and to show honor and respect to her man; while the man is expected to continuously pursue status and wealth, to continuously improve his physique, and to seek higher and higher status so that more and more women, including his woman, will be attracted to him. Red Pill relationship dynamics describes a relationship where the man continually improves himself and furthers his goals, and the woman dedicates herself to supporting him to reach those goals. In other words, Red Pill women are expected to show love in their romantic relationships, while Red Pill men are expected to show narcissism in theirs.

Red Pill inevitably leads to misogyny because Red Pill advocates for men to perpetuate and normalize relationships that are abusive towards women. Red Pill dynamics demand that women not love themselves. Red Pill men insist on keeping their Frame at all times, forcing women to fit into the man's life for his benefit and for her own good. Red Pill inevitably leads to misogyny because the ideal Red Pill man is expected to treat his women the way I treat my goats: like livestock. Like property.

Want More?

Sign up to my mailing list and receive a FREE bonus chapter:

The Philosophical Blind Spot of Red Pill

https://mailchi.mp/4b11cb3d1fdf/red-pill-ideology

Resources for dating and relationship advice:

Youtube:

School of Attraction https://www.youtube.com/c/SchoolOfAttraction

Mended Light
https://www.youtube.com/c/MendedLight

Matthew Hussey
https://www.youtube.com/user/gettheguyteam

> While Hussey's content is marketed towards women, the bulk of his dating and life advice is gender-neutral.

David Tian, PhD and Aura University https://www.youtube.com/c/AuraUniversityMedia

Books:

No More Mister Nice Guy: A Proven Plan for getting what you want in Love, Sex, and Life by Robert Glover

The Mask of Masculinity: How Men Can Embrace Vulnerability, Create Strong Relationships, and Live Their Fullest Lives by Lewis Howes

Trying not to Try by Edward Slingerland

Models: Attract Women through Honesty by Mark Manson

How to Avoid Falling in Love with a Jerk: The Foolproof Way to Follow Your Heart Without Losing Your Mind by John Vann Epp

References / Bibliography

Agrell, Jep, et al. *Counter-Strategies to Infanticide in Mammals: Costs and Consequences*. Oikos, vol. 83, no. 3, [Nordic Society Oikos, Wiley], 1998, pp. 507–17,

AIU – Alliant International University. *Dr. Rebecca Turner Issues Statement Rebutting "Pseudoscience"* (Published 11/20/2006, retrieved 1/14/2022) https://www.newswise.com/articles/dr-rebecca-turner-issues-statement-rebutting-pseudoscience

Allal N, Sear R, Prentice AM, Mace R. "An evolutionary model of stature, age at first birth and reproductive success in Gambian women." *Proc Biol Sci.* 2004 Mar 7;271(1538):465-70

Amato PR, Previti D. "People's Reasons for Divorcing: Gender, Social Class, the Life Course, and Adjustment." *Journal of Family Issues*. 2003;24(5):602-626.

Amato, P.R. and DeBoer, D.D. (2001), "The Transmission of Marital Instability Across Generations: Relationship Skills or Commitment to Marriage?" *Journal of Marriage and Family,* 63: 1038-1051.

Anton, W. *The Manual: What Women Want and How to Give it to them*. Independently Published, 2012.

APS *American Perspectives Survey*, May 2021. Gallup 1990

Arslan, Ruben, Schilling KM, Gerlach TM, Penke L. "Using 26,000 diary entries to show ovulatory changes in sexual desire and behavior." *J Pers Soc Psychol.* 2021 Aug;121(2):410-431

A Woman's Choice. Website. https://partnersofyom.org Retrieved 1/29/2022

Bailey, Martha J et al. "Does younger age at marriage affect divorce? Evidence from Johnson's Executive Order 11241." *Economic inquiry* vol. 59,3 (2021): 1328-1345.

Baxter, D.J., H.E. Barbaree and W.L. Marshall. "Sexual responses to consenting and forced sex in a large sample of rapists and nonrapists" *Behaviour Research and Therapy*. 1986. Volume 24, Issue 5, Pages 513-520.

BBC Trending https://www.bbc.com/news/blogs-trending-36144487

Beall, Alec T., and Jessica L. Tracy. "Women Are More Likely to Wear Red or Pink at Peak Fertility." *Psychological Science*, vol. 24, no. 9, Sept. 2013, pp. 1837–1841

Bernhardt, Kathryn. *Women and Property in China, 960-1949*. Stanford University Press. Stanford, California, 1999.

Biederman, Patricia. “The Duck Wars : Mating season is a brutal time for the female birds, who often are injured or die. Residents along the canals have created a sanctuary.” Los Angeles Times. https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1992-05-10-we-2559-story.html (Published 5/10/1992, retrieved 2/17/2022)

Birkhead, T.R. *Promiscuity: an evolutionary history of sperm competition*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA: 2000.

BLS Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Comparing characteristics and selected expenditures of dual- and single-income households with children.* https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2020/article/comparing-characteristics-and-selected-expenditures-of-dual-and-single-income-households-with-children.htm (Published 2020, retrieved 2/2/2022)

Boots, Collin. “Review of Hooked: New Science on How Casual Sex is affecting our Children.” *Lots of Tiny Robots* (Blog Series) https://www.lotsoftinyrobots.com/2012/08/review-of-hooked-new-science-on-how.html (Published 2012, retrieved 1/29/2022)

Borries, C et al. “DNA analyses support the hypothesis that infanticide is adaptive in langur monkeys.” *Proceedings. Biological sciences* vol. 266,1422 (1999): 901-4.

Bownes IT, O'Gorman EC. “Assailants' sexual dysfunction during rape reported by their victims.*” Med Sci Law*. 1991 Oct;31(4):322-8.

Boxer, Sarah. “Truth or Lies? In Sex Surveys, You Never Know.” *The New York Times*, July 22 2000, Section B, Page 7. https://www.nytimes.com/2000/07/22/arts/truth-or-lies-in-sex-surveys-you-never-know.html

Branschick, Mark. “The High Failure Rate of Second and Third Marriages: Why are second and third marriages more likely to fail?” Psychology Today. https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-intelligent-divorce/201202/the-high-failure-rate-second-and-third-marriages (Published 2/6/2012, retrieved 2/18/2022).

Braver, Sanford L. “The Gender Gap in Standard of Living after Divorce: Vanishingly Small?” *Family Law Quarterly*, vol. 33, no. 1, American Bar Association, 1999, pp. 111–34

Britannica, The Editors of Encyclopaedia. "Vestal Virgins". *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 4 Apr. 2018, https://www.britannica.com/topic/Vestal-Virgins. (Retrieved 2/2/2022).

Broderick, C.B., E.E. Maccoby, and S.M. Dornbusch. “Power in the Governance of Families” Published in *Power in Families*, edited by R.E. Cromwell and D.H. Olson. New York, NY: Sage Publications, Halstead Press Division, John Wiley and Sons. 1975

Broekmans FJ, Knauff EA, te Velde ER, Macklon NS, Fauser BC. “Female reproductive ageing: current knowledge and future trends.” *Trends Endocrinol Metab*. 2007 Mar;18(2):58-65. doi: 10.1016/j.tem.2007.01.004. Epub 2007 Feb 1.

Brunnlieb, Claudia et al. “Vasopressin Increases Cooperative Behavior.” *Proceedings of the National* Academy of Sciences Feb 2016, 113 (8) 2051-2056

Buckstaff, Florence Griswold. “Married Women’s Property in Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman Law and the Origin of the Common-Law Dower.” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 4, [Sage Publications, Inc., American Academy of Political and Social Science], 1893, pp. 33–64

Budig, Michelle J., and Paula England. “The Wage Penalty for Motherhood.” *American Sociological Review*, vol. 66, no. 2, [American Sociological Association, Sage Publications, Inc.], 2001, pp. 204–25

Carter, Sue and Allison Perkeybile. “The Monogamy Paradox: What Do Love and Sex Have to Do With It?” *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*. Volume 6, 2018.

Cartwright, Mark. “The Role of Women in the Roman World.” World History Encyclopedia https://www.worldhistory.org/article/659/the-role-of-women-in-the-roman-world (Published 2/22/2014, retrieved 2/2/2022)

Catania, Joseph A. “A Framework for Conceptualizing Reporting Bias and Its Antecedents in Interviews Assessing Human Sexuality.” *The Journal of Sex Research*, vol. 36, no. 1, Taylor & Francis, Ltd., 1999, pp. 25–38

Census – US Census Bureau. https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2021/marriages-and-divorces.html (Published 4/22/2021, retrieved 2/15/2022)

CDC - Center for Disease Control

Children born out of Wedlock: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/unmarried-childbearing.htm (retrieved 2/15/2022)

Sexual violence statistics: https://www.cdc.gov/injury/features/sexual-violence/index.html (retrieved 1/16/2022)

Chan WFN, Gurnot C, Montine TJ, Sonnen JA, Guthrie KA, Nelson JL "Male Microchimerism in the Human Female Brain." *PLoS ONE* 7(9): e45592. 2012

Chivers, M. L. "A brief review and discussion of sex differences in the specificity of sexual arousal." *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*. 2005, 20, 377–390.

Chudnovskaya, Margarita and Ridhi Kashyap. "Is the End of Educational Hypergamy the End of Status Hypergamy? Evidence from Sweden." *European Sociological Review*, Volume 36, Issue 3, June 2020, Pages 351–365

CPS – Current Population Report, a survey conducted by the US Census Bureau. 2017 data referenced. https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps.html

Collins, Emily, Brad Hershbein. "The Impact of Subsidized Birth Control for College Women: Evidence from the Deficit Reduction Act." Population Studies Center, University of Michigan. May 2011

Cooke, Lynn Prince. "'Doing Gender in Context: Household Bargaining and Risk of Divorce in Germany and the United States." *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 112, no. 2, The University of Chicago Press, 2006, pp. 442–72

Correll, Shelley J., et al. "Getting a Job: Is There a Motherhood Penalty?" *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 112, no. 5, The University of Chicago Press, 2007, pp. 1297–338

County of Los Angeles Public Health https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5c427b2f2714e5d9ba83ae41/t/5d278762c1d9a800012198cd/1562871652606/Requirements+for+Registering+Out-of-Hospital+Births+Occurring+in+Los+Angeles+County+Vital+Records+Jurisdiction.pdf (Retrieved 2/15/2022)

Curry, A. Archaeology: The milk revolution. *Nature* **500,** 20–22 (2013).

Custody X Change. https://www.custodyxchange.com/topics/research/dads-custody-time-2018.php

Cost of custody: "Statistics: Hire a Divorce Attorney for the best Custody Outcome" cases/lawyers https://www.custodyxchange.com/topics/research/divorce-custody-statistics-2021.php (Published 8/21/2021, retrieved 2/13/2022)

Custody by State: “How Much Custody Time Does Dad get in Your State?” https://www.custodyxchange.com/topics/research/dads-custody-time-2018.php (Published 2018, retrieved 2-13-2022)

Daniels K, Abma JC. “Current contraceptive status among women aged 15–49: United States, 2015–2017.” NCHS Data Brief, no 327. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics. 2018

Dawkins, Richard. *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, NY. 1976.

Descormiers, Karine & Raymond R. Corrado (2016) The Right to Belong: Individual Motives and Youth Gang Initiation Rites, Deviant Behavior, 37:11, 1341-1359

Dugas Carla, Slane VH. “Miscarriage” [Updated 2021 Jun 29]. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2022 Jan-. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK532992 (retrieved 2/1/2022)

Dunne MP, Martin NG, Bailey JM, Heath AC, Bucholz KK, Madden PA, Statham DJ. “Participation bias in a sexuality survey: psychological and behavioural characteristics of responders and non-responders.” *Int J Epidemiol*. 1997 Aug;26(4):844-54.

DV Leap 2013 “Rates at which Accused and Adjudicated Batterers received Sole or Join Custody” Domestic Violence Legal Empowerment and Appeals Project (DV LEAP)

England, P., Allison, P.D. and Sayer, L.C. (2016), “Is Your Spouse More Likely to Divorce You if You Are the Older Partner?” *Family Relations*, 78: 1184-1194.

Estes, Andrea. “Doctor Who Quit US Post was warned by State.” *The Boston Globe*. http://archive.boston.com/news/local/articles/2007/04/07/doctor_who_quit_us_post_was_warned_by_state/ (Published 4/7/2007, retrieved 1/29/2022).

Esteve, Albert et al. “The End of Hypergamy: Global Trends and Implications.” *Population and development review* vol. 42,4 (2016): 615-625. doi:10.1111/padr.12012

Fisman, Raymons et al. “Gender Differences in Mate Selection: Evidence From a Speed Dating Experiment” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Volume 121, Issue 2, May 2006, Pages 673–697

A relevant and detailed explanation of this study can be found at https://flowingdata.com/2013/06/12/what-the-sexes-want-

in-speed-dating (Published 6/12/2013, retrieved 2/6/2022)

Frans de Waal. “The Surprising Science of Alpha Males” TED Talk 2018. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BPsSKKL8N0s (Published 7/9/2018, retrieved 2/13/2022)

Frantz, Ozy. *Ozy’s Anti Heartiste FAQ.* Slate Star Codex. <https://slatestarcodex.com/2014/08/20/ozys-anti-heartiste-faq> (Published 8/20/2014, retrieved 1/13/2020)

French, Juliana & Altgelt, Emma & Meltzer, Andrea L.. (2019). “The Implications of Sociosexuality for Marital Satisfaction and Dissolution.” *Psychological Science.* 30.

Frisco, Michelle L., and Kristi Williams. “Perceived Housework Equity, Marital Happiness, and Divorce in Dual-Earner Households.” *Journal of Family Issues*, vol. 24, no. 1, Jan. 2003, pp. 51–73

Gangestad, S. W., Thornhill, R. (1998). “Menstrual cycle variation in women’s preferences for the scent of symmetrical men.” *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*. Series B: Biological Sciences, 265(1399), 927–933.

Gavrilets, Sergey. “Human origins and the transition from promiscuity to pair-bonding” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, June 19 2012.

Geddes, R., & Lueck, D. (2002). “The Gains from Self-Ownership and the Expansion of Women’s Rights.” *The American Economic Review*, 92(4), 1079–1092. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3083297

Gender Bias Study of the Court System in Massachusetts. *New England Law Review*
Volume 24, Spring 1990; article begins on page 745

Gerbault, Pascale et al. “Evolution of lactase persistence: an example of human niche construction.” *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological sciences* vol. 366,1566 (2011): 863-77

Glantz MJ, Chamberlain MC, Liu Q, Hsieh CC, Edwards KR, Van Horn A, Recht L. “Gender disparity in the rate of partner abandonment in patients with serious medical illness.” *Cancer*. 2009 Nov 15;115(22):5237-42.

Gottfried H, Vigilant L, Mundry R, Behringer V, Surbeck M. “Aggression by male bonobos against immature individuals does not fit with predictions of infanticide.” *Aggress Behav*. 2019 May;45(3):300-309.

Gottschall, J.A., Gottschall, T.A. “Are per-incident rape-pregnancy rates higher than per-incident consensual pregnancy rates?” *Human Nature* 14, 1–20 (2003)

Gou, Wu. *Rediscovering the Song Dynasty*. Jiuzhou Press, 2014.

Greathouse, Sarah Michal, et al. “Male Perpetrators Who Sexually Assault Male Victims.” *A Review of the Literature on Sexual Assault Perpetrator Characteristics and Behaviors*, RAND Corporation, 2015, p. 43–46,

GSS - *The General Social Survey*. National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago. 2000, 2018 and 2021 survey data referenced.

Habbema, J Dik F et al. “Realizing a desired family size: when should couples start?” *Human Reproduction* (Oxford, England) vol. 30,9 (2015): 2215-21.

Haderxhanaj, Laura T et al. “Sex in a lifetime: Sexual behaviors in the United States by lifetime number of sex partners, 2006-2010.” *Sexually transmitted diseases* vol. 41,6 (2014): 345-52.

Hall, Jeffrey & Melanie Canterberry. “Sexism and Assertive Courtship Strategies.” *Sex Roles a Journal of Research.* 65:11-12 (January 2010) p. 840-853

Hanson, S.J., Anne E. Burke. “Fertility Control: Contraception, Sterilization, and Abortion” *The Johns Hopkins Manual of Gynecology and Obstetrics*, 4th ed. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2012, pp. 382-395

Harris, Christine R. “Menstrual Cycle and Facial Preferences Reconsidered.” *Sex roles* vol. 64,9-10 (2011): 669-681. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9772-8

Harris, Grant et al. “Explaining the Erectile Responses of Rapists to Rape Stories: The Contributions of Sexual Activity, Non-Consent, and Violence with Injury.” *Archives of sexual behavior.* 2012. 41. 221-9. 10.1007/s10508-012-9940-8.

Harris, Isiah D et al. “Fertility and the aging male.” *Reviews in Urology* vol. 13,4 (2011): e184-90.

Hassan MA, Killick SR. Effect of male age on fertility: evidence for the decline in male fertility with increasing age. *Fertil Steril*. 2003 Jun;79 Suppl 3:1520-7.

Hawkins, Alan J. et al. “Reasons for Divorce and Openness to Marital

Reconciliation" *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 53:6 (2012) 453-463.

Herlihy, David. *Medieval Households*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA: 1985.

Hlavka, Heather R. "Normalizing Sexual Violence: Young Women Account for Harassment and Abuse." *Gender and Society*, vol. 28, no. 3, Sage Publications, Inc., 2014, pp. 337–58,

Holland B, Rice WR. "Experimental removal of sexual selection reverses intersexual antagonistic coevolution and removes a reproductive load." *Proc Natl Acad Sci* U S A. 1999 Apr 27;96(9):5083-8

IFS - The National Institute for Family Studies.

Male Sexlessness: *Male Sexlessness is Rising but not for the reasons Incels Claim.* https://ifstudies.org/blog/male-sexlessness-is-rising-but-not-for-the-reasons-incels-claim (Published 2018, retrieved 1/11/2022).

Virginity and Divorce Rate: *Counterintuitive Trends in the link between Premarital Sex and Marital Stability.* Blog written by Nicholas Wolfinger. https://ifstudies.org/blog/counterintuitive-trends-in-the-link-between-premarital-sex-and-marital-stability (Published 2016, retrieved 1/19/2022)

Marital Happiness: *Does Sexual History Affect Marital Happiness?* Blog written by Nicholas Wolfinger. https://ifstudies.org/blog/does-sexual-history-affect-marital-happiness#:~:text=The%20lowest%20odds%20of%20marital,happy%20marriages%20at%2057%20percent. (Published 10/22/2019, retrieved 1/20/2022)

Age and Divorce Risk: *Want to Avoid Divorce? Wait to get Married, but not too Long.* Blog written by Nicholas Wolfinger. https://ifstudies.org/blog/want-to-avoid-divorce-wait-to-get-married-but-not-too-long (Published 7/16/2015, retrieved 1/25/2022).

Insel TR, Hulihan T. "A gender-specific mechanism for pair bonding: Oxytocin and partner preference formation in monogamous voles." *Behavioral Neuroscience*. 1995;109:782–789

Jewish Virtual Library https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/marriage-in-judaism

Johnson, R. R. (2008). "Assessing the true dangerousness of domestic violence calls." *Law Enforcement Executive Forum*, 8(5), 19-29

Jones, Benedict C., Amanda C. Hahn, Claire I. Fisher, Hongyi Wang, Michal Kandrik, Lisa M. DeBruine. General sexual desire, but not desire for uncommitted sexual relationships, tracks changes in women's hormonal status. *Psychoneuroendocrinology,* Volume 88, 2018, Pages 153-157

Jones, Benedict C., et al. "No Compelling Evidence That Preferences for Facial Masculinity Track Changes in Women's Hormonal Status." *Psychological Science*, vol. 29, no. 6, June 2018, pp. 996–1005

Jones JS, Rossman L, Wynn BN, Ostovar H. "Assailants' sexual dysfunction during rape: prevalence and relationship to genital trauma in female victims." *J Emerg Med*. 2010 May;38(4):529-35.

Kahn, Joan R., and Kathryn A. London. "Premarital Sex and the Risk of Divorce." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 53, no. 4, [Wiley, National Council on Family Relations], 1991, pp. 845–55,

Karraker A, Latham K. "In Sickness and in Health? Physical Illness as a Risk Factor for Marital Dissolution in Later Life." *Health Soc Behav*. 2015 Sep;56(3):420-35.

> The original study was retracted for a calculations error—the total divorce rate was originally reported as 35% instead of the corrected 6%. Additional information can be found at https://retractionwatch.com/2015/07/21/to-our-horror-widely-reported-study-suggesting-divorce-is-more-likely-when-wives-fall-ill-gets-axed (retrieved 2/6/2022)

Kempner, Martha. *State-Level Fights for Comprehensive Sex Ed Reveal Legal Strategies Must Be Rooted in Grassroots Advocacy.* Rewire News Group. https://rewirenewsgroup.com/article/2012/10/02/is-suing-school-over-lack-information-good-strategy-sex-education-advocates (Published 10/2/2012, retrieved 1/29/2022).

Keroack, Erik and John Diggs. *Bonding Imperative.* A Special Report from the Abstinence Clearinghouse. 4/30/2001.

Keroack, Erik. "OXYTOCIN: Is this NANO-PEPTIDE a chemical type of HUMAN 'SUPER-GLUE'?" PowerPoint presentation, 2006, Human Life Alliance. Full PowerPoint can be found at https://www.slideshare.net/rhrc/the-oxytocin-cell (retrieved 1/29/2022).

Klein, Christopher. "Stockholm Syndrome: The True Story of Hostages Loyal to their Captor" History.com. https://www.history.com/news/stockholm-syndrome (Published 4/9/2019, retrieved 2/16/2022).

Knott, C.D., Scott, A.M., O'Connell, C.A. et al. "Possible Male Infanticide in Wild Orangutans and a Re-evaluation of Infanticide

Risk." *Sci Rep* 9, 7806 (2019).

Korkhov, Vadim. "The Red Band: A Stoic Criticism of the Red Pill." Modernstoicism.com (January 6 2018).

Kornrich S, Brines J, Leupp K. "Egalitarianism, Housework, and Sexual Frequency in Marriage." *Am Sociol Rev*. 2013 Feb 1;78(1):26-50

Kposowa AJ. "Divorce and suicide risk." *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* 2003; 57:993.

Kromer, J et al. "Influence of HLA on human partnership and sexual satisfaction." *Scientific reports* vol. 6 32550. 31 Aug. 2016, doi:10.1038/srep32550

Kutchinskas, Susan. "How Keroack Got Oxytocin Wrong." Hug the Monkey (Blog). http://www.huliq.com/421/how-keroack-got-oxytocin-wrong (Published 12/4/2006, retrieved 1/29/2022)

Laumann, Edward O., Gagnon, John H., Michael, Robert T., and Michaels, Stuart. *National Health and Social Life Survey, 1992:* [United States]. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2008-04-17. https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR06647.v2

Lee, Jen-Der. "Childbirth in Early Imperial China". *NAN NÜ* 7.2 (2005): 216-286

Lee, Wang-Sheng and McKinnish, Terra. "The Marital Satisfaction of Differently-Aged Couples." Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2998972 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2998972 7/10/2017

Liddle, Rod. "Why Do We All Lie in Sex Surveys?" *The Guardian* (Published 6/19/2003, retrieved 1/20/2022). https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jun/18/gender.comment

Livingston, Gretchen and Kim Parker. "A Tale of Two Fathers" *PEW Research Center* https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2011/06/15/a-tale-of-two-fathers/ (Published June 2011, retrieved 5/26/2022)

Livingston, Gretchen. "Stay-at-Home Moms and Dads Account for About One-in-Five U.S. Parents" *PEW Research Center* September 2018. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/09/24/stay-at-home-moms-and-dads-account-for-about-one-in-five-u-s-parents/ (Published 9/24/2018, retrieved 5/26/2022)

Lt. Col. Dave Grossman. *On Killing: the Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society.* Back Bay Books. New York, NY, 1995.

Lukas, Dieter, Elise Huchard. The evolution of infanticide by males in mammalian societies. *Science, American Association for the Advancement of Science,* 2014, 346 (6211), pp.841-844

Maddison, Angus. *The World Economy Volume 1: A Millennial Perspective and Volume 2: Historical Statistics.* OECD Development Centre. 2003. Available at: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/the-world-economy_9789264022621-en (retrieved 2/2/2022)

Main, Douglas. Becoming King: Why so few Male Lions Survive to Adulthood (2013).

Mason, Mary Ann and Ann Quirk. "Are Mothers Losing Custody? Read My Lips: Trends in Judicial Decision-Making in Custody Disputes—1920, 1960, 1990, and 1995." *Family Law Quarterly*, vol. 31, no. 2, American Bar Association, 1997, pp. 215–36

Mattle, Beat and Anthony B Wilson. "Body size preferences in the pot-bellied seahorse Hippocampus abdominalis: choosy males and indiscriminate females." *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 63 (2009): 1403 - 1410.

McIlhaney, Joe and Freda Bush. *Hooked: New Science on how Casual Sex is affecting our Children.* Northfield Publishing, Chicago, IL. 2008.

Michael J. Rosenfeld *Who wants the Breakup? Gender and Breakup in Heterosexual Couples* ©Michael J. Rosenfeld*, 2017 Published as a chapter in the 2018 book "Social Networks and the Life Course" p. 221-243 in *Social Networks and the Life Course: Integrating the Development of Human Lives and Social Relational Networks*, edited by Duane F. Alwin, Diane Felmlee, and Derek Kreager

Mitchell, Kirstin R et al. "Why Do Men Report More Opposite-Sex Sexual Partners Than Women? Analysis of the Gender Discrepancy in a British National Probability Survey." *Journal of sex research* vol. 56,1 (2019): 1-8.

Mnookin, Robert and Elenor Maccoby. *Dividing the Child: Social and Legal Dilemmas of Custody.* Harvard University Press. Cambridge, MA: 1992

Morris, C.E., Reiber, C., & Roman, E. "Quantitative Sex Differences in Response to the Dissolution of a Romantic Relationship." *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences.* (2015, July 13).

NAACP – National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. History of Lynching in America https://naacp.org/find-

resources/history-explained/history-lynching-america#:~:text=How%20Many%20People%20were%20lynched,to%20records%20maintained%20by%20NAACP. (Retrieved 2/19/2022)

National Science Foundation. *Animal Attraction: The Many Forms of Monogamy in the Animal Kingdom.* https://www.nsf.gov/discoveries/disc_summ.jsp?cntn_id=126932#:~:text=(Nevertheless%2C%20individual%20pairs%20of%20mammals,practice%20any%20form%20of%20monogamy (Published 2/13/2013, retrieved 1/29/2022)

National Vital Statistics Report. Volume 70, Number 2. "Births: Final Data for 2019" March 23, 2021

NCADV – National Coalition Against Domestic Violence. https://ncadv.org/STATISTICS (retrieved 2/14/2022).

NISVS - National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, 2010. https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/nisvs_sofindings.pdf

Nybo Andersen, A M et al. "Maternal age and fetal loss: population based register linkage study." *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)* vol. 320,7251 (2000): 1708-12. doi:10.1136/bmj.320.7251.1708

OKCupid.

The Case for an Older Woman: How Dating Preferences Change with Age. https://medium.com/@okcupid/the-case-for-an-older-woman-99d8cabacdf5 (Published 2010, retrieved 1/18/2022)

Your Looks and Your Inbox. Blog written by Christian Rudder. Available from: https://web.archive.org/web/20120723173702/http://blog.okcupid.com/index.php/your-looks-and-online-dating (Published 11/17/2009, retrieved 2/6/2022).

Ophir, A. G., Gessel, A., Zheng, D. J., and Phelps, S. M. (2012). "Oxytocin receptor density is associated with male mating tactics and social monogamy." *Horm. Behav.* 61, 445–453.

Orbach, Dara N. et al "Genital interactions during simulated copulation among marine mammals" *Proc. R. Soc.B* 2017 284. 20171265

Ott, Mary A, and John S Santelli. "Abstinence and abstinence-only education." *Current opinion in* obstetrics & gynecology vol. 19,5 (2007): 446-52.

Park, Madison. "Day Care Centers Turn on TV for Toddlers, Study Finds." CNN https://www.cnn.com/2009/HEALTH/11/28/

daycare.children.tv/

Palombit, Ryne A. *Infanticide as Sexual Conflict: Coevolution of Male Strategies and Female Counterstrategies.* Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol 2015;7:a017640 Available at: https://cshperspectives.cshlp.org/content/7/6/a017640.full.pdf (retrieved 3/19/2022)

Penton-Voak, I. S., Perrett, D. I., Castles, D. L., Kobayashi, T., Burt, D. M., Murray, L. K., Minamisawa, R. "Menstrual cycle alters face preference." *Nature,* 399(6738), 741. 1999

Peters, Marianne et al. "Preferences across the menstrual cycle for masculinity and symmetry in photographs of male faces and bodies." *PloS one* vol. 4,1 (2009): e4138. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0004138

Polo, Susana. "The MPAA Rates A Movie More Severely If Women Appear To Enjoy Having Sex" https://www.themarysue.com/mpaa-ratings-sex-women (Published 4/1/2022, retrieved 2/18/2022)

Primer (Youtube Channel) <https://www.youtube.com/c/PrimerLearning> (Retrieved 1/18/2022) To best illustrate this concept, I recommend the videos entitled *Simulating Natural Selection*, *Simulating Competition and Logistic Growth*, and *"What's a Selfish Gene"?*

Quinn, Dan. "Another Example of How the Texas Textbook Wars Undermine Education Far Outside the Lone Star State." Texas Freedom Network. https://tfn.org/another-example-of-how-the-texas-textbook-wars-undermine-education-far-outside-the-lone-star-state/ (Published 9/13/2012, retrieved 1/29/2022)

RAINN - Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network. "Victims of Sexual Violence: Statistics" https://www.rainn.org/statistics/victims-sexual-violence#:~:text=About%203%25%20of%20American%20men,completed%20rape%20in%20their%20lifetime.&text=1%20out%20of%20every%2010%20rape%20victims%20are%20male (Retrieved 2/17/2022)

Regnerus, Mark. *Cheap Sex: the Transformation of Men, Marriage, and Monogamy.* Oxford University Press. New York, NY, 2017.

Relationships in America Survey. Sponsored by The Austin Institute for the Study of Family and Culture. 2014 Report. https://relationshipsinamerica.com/ (retrieved 1/21/2022)

Roberts, S Craig et al. "MHC-correlated odour preferences in humans and the use of oral contraceptives." *Proceedings. Biological sciences* vol. 275,1652 (2008): 2715-22.

Rosenfeld, Michael. "Who Wants the Breakup? Gender and Breakup in

Heterosexual Couples." Published as a chapter in the 2018 book *Social Networks and the Life Course: Integrating the Development of Human Lives and Social Relational Networks*, edited by Duane F. Alwin, Diane Felmlee, and Derek Kreager: Springer. p. 221-243

Rudder, Christian. *Dataclysm: Love, Sex, Race, and Identity—What Our Online Lives Tell Us About Our Offline Selves.* Broadway Books. New York, NY. 2014.

Ruff CB, Burgess ML, Ketcham RA, Kappelman J (2016) "Limb Bone Structural Proportions and Locomotor Behavior in A.L. 288-1 ("Lucy")" *PLoS ONE* 11(11): e0166095

Ryan, Christopher and Cacilda Jethà. *Sex at Dawn: How We Mate, Why We Stray, and What it Means for Modern Relationships.* Harpercollins Publishers, New York, NY, 2010.

Samuels, Kevin. "What is a High Value Man? High Value Men Defined" Youtube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xI1g3wnaLGk (Published 9/9/2020, retrieved 2/12/2022).

Saxon, Lynn. *Sex at Dusk: Lifting the Shiny Wrapping from Sex at Dawn*. Independently Published, 2012.

Schiff, Stacey. "Sex and the Single-Minded." The New York Times. Opinion column, 1/20/2007.

Schwyzer, Hugo. "The Accidental Rapist" https://goodmenproject.com/featured-content/the-accidental-rapist/

Scott, Shelby B et al. "Reasons for Divorce and Recollections of Premarital Intervention: Implications for Improving Relationship Education." *Couple & family psychology* vol. 2,2 (2013): 131-145.

Scully, Diana, and Joseph Marolla. "Convicted Rapists' Vocabulary of Motive: Excuses and Justifications." *Social Problems*, vol. 31, no. 5, 1984, pp. 530–44.

Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History

Stone Tools: https://humanorigins.si.edu/evidence/behavior/stone-tools#:~:text=Early%20Stone%20Age%20Tools&text=The%20earliest%20stone%20toolmaking%20developed,cores%2C%20and%20sharp%20stone%20flakes. (Retrieved 2/11/2022)

Wooden Spears: https://humanorigins.si.edu/evidence/behavior/getting-food/oldest-wooden-spear (Retrieved 1/8/2022)

Solomon, Catherine. *The Lives of Stay-At-Home-Fathers: Masculinity,*

Carework, and Fatherhood in the United States. Emerald Publishing, UK. 2017

Steinman, S. *The Experience of Children in Joint Custody Arrangement: A Report of a Study.* American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 51:403-414 1981.

Stone, Ken. "Of Nearly 1,000 Rape Kits Tested in DA Project, 60% Have No Male DNA" Times of San Diego. https://timesofsandiego.com/crime/2019/05/23/of-nearly-1000-rape-kits-tested-in-da-project-60-have-no-male-dna (Published 5/23/2019, retrieved 2/17/2022)

Strassberg DS, Lowe K. "Volunteer bias in sexuality research." *Arch Sex Behav*. 1995 Aug;24(4):369-82

Strauss, Neil. *The Game: Penetrating the Secret Society of Pickup Artists.* HarperCollins Publishers New York, NY 2005.

Strauss, Neil. *The Truth: An Uncomfortable Book about Relationships*. HarperCollins Publishers New York, NY 2015

Suschinsky, Kelly D., and Martin L. Lalumière. "Prepared for Anything? An Investigation of Female Genital Arousal in Response to Rape Cues." *Psychological Science*, vol. 22, no. 2, Sage Publications, Inc., 2011, pp. 159–65

Terrazas, Aaron. "Rising Trend of Stay-at-Home-Dads Hits All-Time High" https://www.zillow.com/research/stay-at-home-dads-20190/ (Published 6/7/2018, retrieved 5/25/2022).

Thakore, Shreena. "It Matters WHY You Think Rape is Wrong." *TED Talk.* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Dy28zB9hBZc (Published 1/5/2015, retrieved 2/13/2022).

The Economist. "When Statistics Mislead: Breast cancer is far more Destructive than Prostate Cancer." https://www.economist.com/graphic-detail/2018/02/02/breast-cancer-is-far-more-destructive-than-prostate-cancer (Published 2/2/2018, retrieved 2/10/2022)

Thomas, Andrew G., et al. "Current Fertility Status Does Not Predict Sociosexual Attitudes and Desires in Normally Ovulating Women." *Evolutionary Psychology*, Jan. 2021

This Film is Not Yet Rated. 2016. Movie Produced by Eddie Schmidt.

Tracy, Jessica L, and Alec T Beall. "The impact of weather on women's tendency to wear red or pink when at high risk for conception." *PloS one* vol. 9,2 e88852. 21 Feb. 2014,

Trueheart, Jared. *The Red Pill Ideology: The Love Child of Pick-Up Artists and Feminists*. Independently Published, 2019

Turner, Rebecca and Margaret Altemus. “Preliminary Research on Plasma Oxytocin in Normal Cycling Women: Investigating Emotion and Interpersonal Distress” *Psychiatry: Interpersonal and Biological Processes* Vol. 62, No. 2. July 1999. p.97-113

USDA Food Plans: Cost of Food Report (monthly report) 2022. https://www.fns.usda.gov/cnpp/usda-food-plans-cost-food-reports-monthly-reports (retrieved 5/25/2022)

Valizadeh, Roosh. “5 Reasons Why You Should Never Experiment with Casual Sex.” https://www.rooshv.com/5-reasons-why-you-should-never-experiment-with-casual-sex (Blog published 11/22/2021, retrieved 1/21/2022)

Valizadeh, Roosh. “Choose Your Game Funnel.” Available at: https://web.archive.org/web/20190429122853/https://www.rooshv.com/choose-your-game-funnel (Published 8/9/2013, retrieved 2/5/2022)

Valizadeh, Roosh. *Day Bang: How to Casually Pick Up Girls During the Day*. Independently Published. 2011

Valizadeh, Roosh. *Lady*. Independently Published, 2019.

Vrangalova, Zhana, et al. “Birds of a Feather? Not When It Comes to Sexual Permissiveness.” *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, vol. 31, no. 1, Feb. 2014, p. 93–113,

Waite, Linda J., and Lee A. Lillard. “Children and Marital Disruption.” *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 96, no. 4, University of Chicago Press, 1991, p. 930–53

Walker, K., and B. Hare. “Bonobo baby dominance: Did female defense of offspring lead to reduced male aggression?” *Bonobos: Unique in Mind, Brain, and Behavior*, 2018, p. 49–64.

Wang, Wendy. “The Link between a College Education and a Lasting Marriage.” Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/12/04/education-and-marriage (Published 12/4/2015, retrieved 1/25/2022).

Watson, M. “Custody Alternatives: Defining the best interests of the child.” *Family Relations* 30:474 (1981)

Wedekind, Claus, et al. “MHC-Dependent Mate Preferences in Humans.” *Proceedings: Biological Sciences*, vol. 260, no. 1359, The Royal Society, 1995, p. 245–49

Weitzman, Lenore. *The Divorce Revolution: The Unexpected Social and Economic Consequences for Women and Children in America*. New York:

The Free Press, 1985

White, L.K. and Booth, A. (1985) “The Quality and Stability of Remarriage: The Role of Step-Children.” *American Sociological Review* 50: 346-358

Wikipedia “Women in Ancient Rome” https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Women_in_ancient_Rome (retrieved 2/2/2022)

Wilcox AJ, Dunson DB, Weinberg CR, Trussell J, Baird DD. “Likelihood of conception with a single act of intercourse: providing benchmark rates for assessment of post-coital contraceptives.” *Contraception*. 2001 Apr;63(4):211-5. doi: 10.1016/s0010-7824(01)00191-3. PMID: 11376648

Williams JR, Insel TR, Harbaugh CR, Carter CS. “Oxytocin administered centrally facilitates formation of a partner preference in prairie voles (Microtus ochrogaster).” *Journal of Neuroendocrinology*. 1994;6:247–250.

Wojciechowska, Agnieszka. *From Amyrtaeus to Ptolemy: Egypt in the Fourth century B.C*. Harrassowitz Verlag, 2016.

Wong, Ali. *Hard Knock Wife*. Netflix.

Yasmin, A. (2014). “Middle Class Women in Mughal India.” *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress*, *75*, 295–306. http://www.jstor.org/stable/44158394

Young, Kimball. *Isn’t One Wife Enough?* Henry Holt and Company, USA. 1954.

Young LJ, Nilsen R, Waymire KG, MacGregor GR, Insel TR. “Increased affiliative response to vasopressin in mice expressing the vasopressin receptor from a monogamous vole.” *Nature*. 1999;400:766–768.

Young LJ. “The Neural Basis of Pair Bonding in a Monogamous Species: A Model for Understanding the Biological Basis of Human Behavior.” In: National Research Council (US) Panel for the Workshop on the Biodemography of Fertility and Family Behavior; Wachter KW, Bulatao RA, editors. Offspring: Human Fertility Behavior in Biodemographic Perspective. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2003. 4. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK97287

Zamani Z, Parekh U. “Vanishing Twin Syndrome.” [Updated 2021 Jul 31]. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2022 Jan-. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK563220/